

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

EX LIBRIS
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAENSIS



For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

LESYA UKRAYINKA'S BOYARYNYA



by

Orysia Prokopiw

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF SLAVONIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

August, 1968

Thesis
1968 (F)
179

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies for acceptance, a thesis entitled, "Lesya Ukrayinka's Boyarynya" submitted by Orysia Prokopiw in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

ABSTRACT

It is the purpose of this thesis to provide a comprehensive examination of Lesya Ukrayinka's poetic drama Boyarynya. By applying the principles of dramatic expression--exposition, complication, and resolution, and by a scene-by-scene scrutiny, this study concludes that Boyarynya presents a social-psychological tragedy. The action takes place mainly in Muscovy in the 1660's and 1670's, and tells the story of a young boyar and his wife who, in maintaining a pacifist ideology, become bound in the shackles of an alien autocratic socio-political system. Their tragedy results when, in having realized the ignobleness of their pacifism, they find themselves incapable of breaking their fetters so as to participate in their nation's struggle for freedom. The hero's desire to take action is overpowered by his fear of the autocratic ruler, while the heroine's is overpowered by compassion for her husband. The plot illustrates L. Ukrayinka's constantly recurring theme: an oppressed nation must seek strength and honor in a united revolutionary struggle against its oppressor.

Boyarynya reveals clearly the genius of L. Ukrayinka. In measuring the play by universal standards of dramatic art, this study shows that Boyarynya possesses the qualities of great drama. It is a tightly constructed play that never falters in its development from beginning to end. It contains a vital theme, memorable characters, and a brilliant plot, and its dynamic dialogue is dramatic poetry of the first rank. The final word on Boyarynya still remains to be said, however, and this word can only be said after Boyarynya has been viewed on the stage.

PREFACE

Boyarynya has received relatively little attention in literary criticism. It is one of the most neglected of Lesya Ukrayinka's poetic dramas. Because of its sharp political overtones Boyarynya is the playwright's only drama that is eschewed by Soviet publishers. Soviet literary scholars either ignore the work completely or are evasive in their comments on it. The one essay on the play that was written in Soviet Ukraine avoids a direct discussion of the drama. Western scholars, too, have been brief or have presented unsatisfactory conclusions on Boyarynya. They have been obsessed primarily by the ideological aspect, or theme, and by the theme's importance to Ukraine. The only existing Western study on the drama is imbued with nationalistic fervor.

In general, Boyarynya has been mentioned only in passing references wherein it has been treated merely as that poetic drama in which L. Ukrayinka presents a Ukrainian question. This is an inadequate treatment of the play. First, Boyarynya should be considered as a brilliant achievement of L. Ukrayinka. Second, it should be reviewed in terms of and given its rightful place in world drama. To say that Boyarynya presents a Ukrainian question is misleading. The fact is that Boyarynya possesses a universality of appeal in space as well as in time. The drama is pertinent, as some previous scholars have noted, not only to the seventeenth-century Ukraine which it depicts, but to the Ukraine of the playwright's day. It is pertinent, furthermore, to contemporary Ukraine and, more important, it is

pertinent to every subjugated people or subservient individual of the past, present or future; it presents an everlastingly vital universal problem.

But it is not only the universality of appeal in time and in space that makes a great drama. A great drama must contain an interesting and a well-constructed plot, a brilliant dialogue, and living characters in convincing situations; it must stir, move and enrich the audience, and by its presentation of life problems and situations it should elucidate some of our own difficulties.¹

This thesis purports to illustrate that Boyarynya, when measured against these universal criteria of dramatic art, possesses the attributes of great drama. Since there exists no comprehensive analysis of any of L. Ukrayinka's plays and since few scholarly works exist on this playwright in English, perhaps this investigation can make a modest contribution toward these ends.

The study begins with a brief introduction on L. Ukrayinka and the drama in question. The second chapter relates the plot in Boyarynya, summarizes separately the two interwoven lines of action in the plot, and concludes with the various motives which furnish the design of the play. The third chapter contains a chronological and critical survey of the literary responses on Boyarynya, while the two final chapters involve an analysis of the artistic qualities of Boyarynya, of the dramatic construction and of the dialogue.

¹J. Mersand, The Play's the Thing (New York: The Modern Chapbooks, 1948), pp. 25-38.

The author of this thesis wishes to express her sincere gratitude to Professor Y. Slavutych, who supervised her work, for his patience, encouragement, and stimulation, and to Professors H. A. Hargreaves and G. Schaarschmidt for their services. She is indebted to Professor A. Malycky of The University of Calgary for the generous loans from his private library.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	iv
TRANSLITERATION TABLE	vii
KEY TO SYMBOLS USED IN THE POETIC ANALYSIS	viii
 Chapter	
I. LESYA UKRAYINKA (An Introduction)	1
II. THE PLOT IN <u>BOYARYNYA</u>	8
III. <u>BOYARYNYA</u> IN LITERARY CRITICISM	33
IV. THE DRAMATIC COMPOSITION OF <u>BOYARYNYA</u>	63
The Theme	
Character Creation	
Plot Construction	
V. THE DIALOGUE IN <u>BOYARYNYA</u>	94
The Auxiliary Characters	
The Essential Characters	
CONCLUSIONS	130
BIBLIOGRAPHY	133

TRANSLITERATION TABLE

Ukrainian and Russian	English	Ukrainian and Russian	English
а	a	р	r
б	b	с	s
в	v	т	t
д	d	у	u
е	e	ф	f
ж	zh	х	kh
з	z	ц	ts
й	y	ч	ch
к	k	ш	sh
л	l	щ	shch
м	m	ь	' (omitted in proper nouns in the text)
н	n		
о	o	ю	yu
п	p	я	ya

Ukrainian only

ї	yi
є	ye
г	h
ґ	g
и, ий	y
і	i

Russian only

г	g
ё	e
и	i
ъ	"
ы, ый	y
э	e

KEY TO SYMBOLS USED IN THE POETIC ANALYSIS

Ukrainian ий = English yj

phonemic [aw] as in out

phonemic [ow] as in oat

^ omission of hypermeter and hovering accent

// caesura

⊂ pyrrhic foot

CHAPTER I

LESYA UKRAYINKA

(An Introduction)

Lesya Ukrayinka (Larysa Kosach-Kvitka) (1871-1913), the greatest Ukrainian poetess, was born in Zvyahel, Volyn, Ukraine, on February 25, 1871. Her father, Petro Kosach, was a judge and her mother, Olha, is known in Ukrainian literature as the poetess Olena Pchilka. Both parents were staunch supporters of the Ukrainian cultural movement; their six children received their education at home rather than at the existing Russified schools. Besides the Ukrainian language, literature and history, L. Ukrayinka studied the languages, literatures and histories of various peoples. She knew Russian, Polish, German, French, Italian, Bulgarian, Spanish, Greek and Latin. She translated some works of European and Russian masters into Ukrainian. Early in life the poetess contracted tuberculosis; as a result, she was forced to frequent health resorts in Italy, Crimea, the Caucasus and Egypt. She died in Georgia, August 1, 1913.¹

¹For a biography of L. Ukrayinka see Constantine Bida, "Life and Work," in Lesya Ukrainka, Selected Works, trans. Vera Rich (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1968); Anatol' I. Kostenko (ed.), Spohady pro Lesyu Ukrayinku (Kiev: Radyans'ky pys'mennyk, 1963); Mykola Zerov, Do dzherel (Krakiv-L'viv: Ukrayins'ke vydavnytstvo, 1943), pp. 150-160; A. Kaspruk, Lesya Ukrayinka: literaturny portret (Kiev: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oyi literatury, 1958); Varvara Kurashova, "Materiyaly do naukovoï biografiyi Lesi Ukrayinky (Dytyachi y molodi lita 1891-1896 rr.)," in Lesya Ukrayinka, Publikatsiyi, statyi, doslidzhennya (Kiev: Akademiya nauk Ukr. RSR., 1954), Vol. I, pp. 195-234; and Petro Odarchenko, in his foreword, in Lesya Ukrayinka, Tvory (New York: Tyshchenko and Bilous Publishing Co., 1953-1954), Vol. I, pp. xi-xxxxi.

At the age of nine, L. Ukrayinka wrote her first poem, "Nadiya" ("Hope").² Her first collection of lyrics, Na krylakh pisen' (On Wings of Songs), appeared in 1893 in Lviv.³ By the turn of the century her poetry had undergone crystallization, acquiring unusual courage, potency and revolutionary fervor; it "reached its summits and equalled the greatest examples of T. Shevchenko's political poetry."⁴ It became an ardent defender of the oppressed, a formidable avenger against oppressors, a constant pinprick for the passive and submissive, and a fervid appeal for a united and uncompromising struggle against tyranny. In 1898 Ivan Franko wrote that on comparing the works of the contemporary Ukrainian poets with those of L. Ukrayinka, the poetess was "about the only man" in Ukraine.⁵ Oleksander Biletsky, in his study of L. Ukrayinka and Russian literature of the 1880's and 1890's, states that Franko's phrase could be extended to incorporate also L. Ukrayinka's relationship to the Russian poets or 'Men of the Eighties.'⁶ In 1901, Franko ranked L. Ukrayinka as the best poet in

²M. V. Bulavyts'ka, Lesya Ukrayinka: bibliohrafichny pokazhchyk (Kiev: Akademiya Nauk Ukr. RSR., 1956), p. 9.

³Ivan Franko, "Lesya Ukrayinka," Tvory v dvadtsyaty tomakh (Kiev: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oyi literatury, 1955), Vol. XVII, p. 263.

⁴Petro Odarchenko, "Lesya Ukrayinka i M.P. Drahomaniv (Do pytannya pro vplyv M.P. Drahomanova na Lesyu Ukrayinku)," in Lesya Ukrayinka, Tvory (New York: Tyshchenko and Bilous Publishing Co., 1953-1954), Vol. III, p. 43.

⁵Ivan Franko, "Lesya Ukrayinka," Tvory v dvadtsyaty tomakh (Kiev: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oyi literatury, 1955), Vol. XVII, p. 253. Franko was referring to the virility in the cycle "Nevil'nychi pisni" ("Songs of Slaves") written 1895-1896.

⁶O. I. Bilets'ky, "Lesya Ukrayinka i rosiys'ka literatura 80-90 rr.," Vid davnyny do suchasnosti (Kiev: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo

Ukraine. "This talent is strong and masculine throughout," he wrote, "although not devoid of feminine grace and tenderness."⁷

From lyrical poetry L. Ukrayinka's attention gravitated to the dramatic form--monologues, dialogues, dramatic scenes and, after a trial of prose drama,⁸ to her favorite genre, the poetic drama. Even though L. Ukrayinka continued to write lyrical poetry, her poetic dramas excelled her lyrics. "Dynamism, dialectical power, depth of thought, and the forceful delineation of her heroes . . . " are the main characteristics of her plays⁹ which present a conflict between ideas rather than a conflict between personages.¹⁰ "Master of problematics,"¹¹ "dramatist of the highest human passions,"¹² "an original

khudozhn'oyi literatury, 1960), Vol. II, p. 268. Bilets'ky punctuates L. Ukrayinka's heroic strength of spirit and compares her to A. M. Gorky.

⁷Ivan Franko, "Z ostannikh desyatylyt' XIX v.," Literaturno-krytychni statyi (Kiev: Derzhlitvydav, 1950), p. 345. Cf. Zerov, Do dzherel, pp. 163-164, 167.

⁸Blakytna troyanda (The Sky-blue Rose) (1896) and Proshchannya (Farewell) [1896]. In Lesya Ukrayinka, Tvory v desyaty tomakh, ed. Oleh Babyshkin (Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oyi literatury, 1963-1965), Vol. III, pp. 7-130.

⁹C. H. Andrusyshen and W. Kirkconnell, "Lesya Ukrainka," The Ukrainian Poets, 1189-1962 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1963), p. 254.

¹⁰Mykola Ohloblyn-Hlobenko, Istoryko-literaturni statyi. Zapysky naukovoho tovarystva imeny Shevchenka (New York-Paris-Munich, 1958), Vol. CLXVII, p. 50.

¹¹R[oman Mlynovets'ky] Zadesnyans'ky, "'Lisova pisnya' Lesi Ukrayinky ta 'Zatopleny dzvin' Havptmana,'" Krytychni narysy: tvorchist' Lesi Ukrayinky (N.p.: Krytychna dumka, n.d.), Vol. IV, p. 108 (2nd ed., p. 132).

¹²K. Kukhalashvili, Lesya Ukrayinka--publitsyst (Kiev: Dnipro, 1965), p. 3.

philosopher-innovator,"¹³ "master in depicting the human soul"¹⁴ and "master of psychological characteristics"¹⁵ are some of the titles that describe the poet-playwright's dexterity.

Throughout her literary career, L. Ukrayinka drew her inspirations not only from Ukrainian channels but from various historical epochs of various peoples--from classical antiquity, early Christianity, Western and Eastern Middle Ages, the Puritans in America in the seventeenth century, the French Revolution and the English occupation of Egypt. She drew many inspirations from the Old Testament and from European literature. Under her pen European themes received a completely original treatment,¹⁶ thus she "enriched not only Ukrainian literature, but world literature."¹⁷ Her fame was almost entirely posthumous, however. This is partly because her works were subject to persecution by the Russian government¹⁸ and partly because her poetic

¹³Ibid.

¹⁴L. S. Polushkina, "Lesya Ukrayinka yak mayster psykholohichnoyi kharakterystyky ('Kaminny hospodar')," Radyans'ke literaturoznavstvo, No. 2 (February, 1965), p. 30.

¹⁵Ibid. In title.

¹⁶Ohloblyn-Hlobenko, Istoryko-literaturni statyi, pp. 47-48, Cf. Leonila I. Mishchenko, Lesya Ukrayinka v literaturnomu zhytti (Kiev: Dnipro, 1964), p. 196.

¹⁷Mishchenko, ibid.

¹⁸In regard to tsarist censorship see Varvara Kurashova, "Peresliduvannya tvoriv Lesi Ukrayinky tsars'koyu tsenzuroyu," in Lesya Ukrayinka, Publikatsiyi, statyi, doslidzhennya (Kiev: Akademiya nauk Ukr. RSR, 1956), Vol. II, pp. 453-485; Yevheniya Polyans'ka, "Lirychny tsykl v tvorchosti Lesi Ukrayinky," in Lesya Ukrayinka, Publikatsiyi, statyi, doslidzhennya (Kiev: Akademiya nauk Ukr. RSR, 1956), Vol. II,

dramas were not understood; they were criticized as ancient, exotic and insignificant to Ukraine. In 1908 H. Khotkevych, for example, in praising her first prose drama, which was artistically weaker than the other dramas, commented that L. Ukrayinka was "a greater poet in depicting real life than in the ascetic outlines of her favorite Jews, Egyptians, and all kinds of other antiquities."¹⁹ Her contemporaries failed to recognize the allegorical nature of her plays, that the Egyptians and Judaens in *Babylonian Captivity* or the Greeks and the neophytes in the Roman Empire are pellucid pseudonyms for Ukrainians in the Russian Empire.²⁰ What is more important, her contemporaries failed to recognize that her allegorical dramas present significant universal problems.

Out of the twenty plays in L. Ukrayinka's literary heritage, seventeen spring from historical sources. Out of these seventeen, one, Boyarynya (The Boyar's Wife), which was written in 1910, finds its source in the history of Ukraine. The main setting is Muscovy. The action takes place in the 1660's and 1670's when Ukraine was plunging into its historical era known as "the Ruin." This is the era of the encroachment of Muscovite dominion over Ukraine. It followed in consequence of the Treaty of Pereyaslav (1654) between Muscovy and

p. 248; Olena Shpyl'ova, "Dramatychni poemy Lesi Ukrayinky 'Vavylons'ky polon' i 'Na ruyinakh'," in Lesya Ukrayinka, Publikatsiyi, statti, doslidzhennya (Kiev: Akademiya nauk Ukr. RSR, 1960), Vol. III, pp. 195-241; and Kostenko, Spohady . . ., p. 31.

¹⁹Zerov, Do dzherel, p. 184, citing H. Khotkevych, "Literaturni vrazhinnya," Literaturno-naukovy vistnyk, 1909, No. II, p. 404.

²⁰Cf. Zerov, Do dzherel, pp. 177-179; and Bida, "Life and Work," pp. 46-47.

Ukraine, Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky's death (1657), and the Treaty of Andrusiv (1667) whereby Poland and Muscovy divided Ukraine at the Dnieper. Ukrainians were divided not only territorially but also in orientation and in allegiance. They were either pro-Muscovite and anti-Polish, pro-Polish and anti-Muscovite, or anti-Muscovite and anti-Polish. They followed a number of incompetent leaders until in 1668 Hetman Petro Doroshenko united the Ukrainian lands under his leadership. His success was shortlived, however. The Muscovites regained their hold on the Left Bank and, although in 1672 Doroshenko again defeated the Poles on the Right Bank, he was attacked by a Muscovite army in Chyhyryn in 1676 and was forced to surrender.²¹ The Ukrainian-Muscovite relations of this period are a vital part of Boyarynya.

Whereas Ukrainian historical events lie in the background of the drama, Muscovy lies in its foreground, for it is where the hero and heroine of the drama reside. This is during the latter part of the reign of Tsar Alexis I. L. Ukrayinka accurately and meticulously depicts the Muscovite way of life, its crudity, its ritualism and formalism, the lack of respect for human personality, the absolute obedience and servility, and the seclusion of women. She reveals also the corrupt government administration, the enormous power and authority

²¹For a concise historical background see B. Krupnytsky, "The Period of Ruin," Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopaedia (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1963), Vol. I, pp. 642-647; and Orysia Prokopiw, "The Kozak-Hetman State," The Ukrainians: An Outline History (Calgary: The Centennial Ukrainian Committee, 1967), pp. 8-12.

of the tsar, and the extreme government centralization.²²

Boyarynya, as the so-called "exotic" dramas, is allegorical.²³

It reflects the national problems of L. Ukrayinka's era, when the Ukrainian economy was ruthlessly exploited by Russia, when Ukrainian culture was being stifled by the Tsarist government, when Russification and the loss of a Ukrainian national consciousness became the product of the Russian school, and when some Ukrainians orientated themselves toward Russia politically.²⁴ The drama mirrors, no less, the problems of contemporary Ukraine in the Soviet Union. Thus, as an erudite historian of Ukraine's past, L. Ukrayinka reflected its present and became a true prophet of its future.

But more important still is Boyarynya's manifest universality, for the revolutionary and pacifist ideals that conflict in the drama and the human souls that are so skilfully portrayed in their social-psychological dilemma are universal and timeless. It is on this universal aspect of Boyarynya, as well as on the artistic aspect, that this thesis purports to shed light.

²²For Muscovite culture see Nicholas V. Riasanovsky, A History of Russia (New York: Oxford University Press, 1963), pp. 157-231; D. S. Mirsky, Russia: A Social History (London: The Cresset Press, 1942); E. Elnett, Historic Origin and Social Development of Family Life in Russia (New York: Columbia University Press, 1926); and F. W. Halle, Women in Soviet Russia (New York: Viking Press, 1935).

²³See Mykhaylo Dray-Khmara's allegorical interpretation of the drama in his essay "Boyarynya," in Lesya Ukrayinka, Tvory (Tyshchenko and Bilous Publishing Co., 1953-1954), Vol. VIII, pp. 96-98.

²⁴For this period in Ukrainian history see "Ukraine in the Russian Empire 1800-1917," Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopaedia, Vol. I, pp. 667-696; and Orysia Prokopiw, "Ukraine in the Tsarist Empire, 1775-1917," The Ukrainians, pp. 14-15.

CHAPTER II

THE PLOT IN BOYARYNYA

Boyarynya is composed of five acts. The first act is set in Ukraine in the 1660's at the home of a Cossack officer, Oleksa Perebiyny. It acquaints the reader or audience with Oksana and Stepan--the two main personages of the poetic drama, with their family backgrounds and with the political history of Ukraine following the Treaty of Pereyslav in 1654. The remaining four acts of Boyarynya are laid in Muscovy in Stepan's home. They reveal the political and social life in Muscovy in the 1660's and 1670's and the Ukrainian-Muscovite relations of this period.

ACT I

1

The first scene of the play centers around Stepan, a young boyar of Ukrainian origin, who is on a visitation in Ukraine with a company of elder boyars. While his colleagues are carousing at a banquet, which takes place behind the scenes, Stepan is visiting Oleksa Perebiyny who was once his father's Cossack companion. Introductory lines indicate that Stepan is not respected or trusted by his boyar confreres, that he fears them, and that his stay at Perebiyny's means freedom to him. Stepan enjoys the hospitality of Perebiyny and his wife and of their daughter, Oksana, who was his childhood

¹ Although there was no necessity for the playwright to divide her acts into scenes, a scenic demarcation in this analysis will serve for clarity, precision, and objectivity.

sweetheart, but in the second scene he finds an antagonist in their son, Ivan.

A conflict between the protagonist and antagonist arises during Stepan's exposition. Stepan relates that during the hetmanate of Ivan Vyhovsky,² his father's property had been devastated, that his father had suffered great hardships until he "acquired something [the boyar position] in Moscow," that at the Pereyaslav deliberations³ his father had pledged allegiance to Muscovy and that, after his father's death, Stepan had abandoned his studies in Kiev to assist his mother in Muscovy. This exposition triggers an ideological duel between Stepan and Ivan because Ivan views Ukrainian allegiance to Muscovy or to Poland as treason. He accuses those, including Stepan, who have sworn allegiance to Muscovy of betraying Ukraine for personal gain. Ivan ardently believes in an armed struggle for an independent Ukraine.

Stepan, on the other hand, denies that his father had betrayed Ukraine and emigrated to Muscovy for personal interests. Stepan declares that his father pledged allegiance to Muscovy because he did not want to serve the Poles in Ukraine; he preferred, instead, "to serve the native [Orthodox] faith on foreign land [Muscovy], to help his oppressed brothers [subjugated by Poland], at least from afar, by

²Vyhovsky was elected hetman in 1657. His signing of the Union of Hadyach with Poland in 1658 and his favoring of the upper classes led to agitation which caused his downfall in 1659.

³The Treaty of Pereyaslav (a military alliance) was signed in 1654 by Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky and Tsar Alexis. It is not clear, however, whether the playwright is referring to this date or to 1659 when Muscovy dictated the Pereyaslav Articles to the young hetman, Yuriy Khmelnytsky.

winning the tsar's favor for them."⁴ Stepan follows in his father's political footsteps because he fears that an armed struggle in Ukraine would be fratricidal; he refers to the parable about Cain and Abel and his father's teaching to beware that he not be Cain, and also to the principle that "the musket and the sword" do not have "more strength and honor than the pen and a sincere word."⁵

During the verbal duel, Perebiyny interjects to appease his son's anger by explaining that during the Pereyaslav deliberations "one thought in two ways," that the consequences of one's actions could not then be foreseen, and that not all people are capable of breaking an oath after having pledged loyalty. He emphasizes the complexity of Ukrainian affairs by illustrating that even the wisdom of Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky did not guide him to act independently. On the other hand, in reference to the biblical passage, Perebiyny tells Stepan that they are not accustomed to such ideas, but he also admits that the world would contain less evil if everyone thought as Stepan.

In this verbal duel emerges the basic issue of the play, the issue of national disunity as a result of a divided allegiance of the Ukrainian nation. The followers of Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky, as represented in the personage of Stepan, uphold an anti-Polish policy

⁴Lesya Ukrayinka, Boyarynya, in Tvory (New York: Tyshchenko and Bilous Publishing Co., 1954), Vol. VIII, p. 115. (This edition is an offset reproduction of L. Ukrayinka's Tvory, 12 vols., edited by B. Yakubs'ky; Kiev: Knyhospilka, 1927-1930.)

⁵Ibid., p. 116.

and, out of mutual respect for the Greek Orthodox faith and opposition to Roman Catholicism, have allied with the tsar. The followers of Hetman Ivan Vyhovsky, not represented in the drama, have allied with Poland against Muscovy; while other Ukrainians, as represented by Oleksa and Ivan Perebiyny, prefer to attain national objectives independently. The particular question that the playwright sets forth to be resolved is Stepan's viewpoint, i.e. do "the pen and a sincere word" have "more strength and honor" than the "musket and the sword"?

In the tender garden scene that follows, Stepan, in proposing to Oksana, emphasizes the contrast between life in Muscovy and life in Ukraine. While in his homeland, Stepan feels "like the prisoner" who has "escaped the dungeon" but must soon return to it. He stresses that Oksana lives in freedom and that there cannot be anything attractive for her in Muscovy. But, on Oksana's reassurance of her love for him, they agree to marry and to live in Muscovy where only Stepan's "true love" is to replace "the joys of the native land."

In their subsequent discussion about war and peace, Oksana's opinion coincides with Stepan's. She is attracted to Stepan by his gentleness and by the fact that his hand is "clean [free] from blood." Oksana refers to other gentlemen whose hands seem to be covered with "brothers' blood" and exclaims that she "probably would never accept a ring from the hand of such a knight."⁶

⁶Ibid., p. 120.

The joy and excitement of her betrothal erase any fear that Oksana may have had of moving to an alien country. She agrees with Stepan that there will be nothing foreign in their home and reassures herself that Muscovy could not be so alien after all, since the religious faith there is identical to Ukraine's and since there is a similarity between the Ukrainian and Muscovite languages. Thus, this scene, besides establishing that Oksana holds the same national ideology as does Stepan, raises the second question that is to be resolved--can Oksana survive the new life in Muscovy?

ACT II

The second act is a brief introduction to the Muscovite way of life. In the first scene Stepan's mother advises Oksana to accept that culture because of her position as a Muscovite boyar's wife. In order to convince Oksana of this necessity, Mother seeks aid in aphorisms, as "whatever the country--such is the custom, and whatever the city--such is the habit," and "live with wolves, howl like wolves."⁷ Oksana has already discovered that she is an unwelcome foreigner in Muscovy, that women there are secluded in their terems and that she abhors the Muscovite styles in clothing. Oksana bitterly protests against Stepan's wearing of the boyar, instead of the Cossack, attire and against having to wear the garb designed for the boyar's wife.

⁷Ibid., pp. 124, 123 respectively.

The second scene consists of a comparison of some aspects of the Muscovite and Ukrainian cultures. Hanna and Oksana discuss the seclusion of young ladies, the celebrating of holidays and the pronunciation of names. A delightful touch of comedy enters their dialogue about betrothal customs--each finds the other's betrothal custom most peculiar.

The climax of the second act is in the third scene when Stepan requests Oksana to greet the visiting boyars according to the local custom, i.e. by kissing a boyar's lips as she serves his beverage. This custom is most repugnant to Oksana and she, therefore, refuses to make her appearance. Stepan and his family, who fear the tsar's punishment if Oksana does not obey, imbue the same fear into Oksana and finally invoke her to conform to this custom.

Oksana's problems are beginning to emerge. She has begun to realize that all personal freedom has been lost, that her new home is like an "infidel's prison," that her husband's existence in Muscovy is a slavish one and that fear is a dominant factor in their life. If she does not comply with the status quo, then she may endanger not only herself and her husband, but both their families. Life in Muscovy is not quite what the newlyweds had planned.

ACT III

Act III, Scene 1, is a reversion to political history. A Cossack messenger has arrived from Ukraine and Stepan quietly converses with the guest in a remote room of his home. The Cossack bears a petition which Stepan must forward to the tsar; it requests

the tsar's protection against the injustices, violence, and corruption of the Muscovite officialdom in Ukraine.⁸ Stepan realizes that the difficulty in gaining such protection lies in the corruptness of the entire tsarist colonial administrative machine. He is aware that even if the tsar did dispatch someone to supervise his officials in Ukraine "one [voyevoda] is no better than the other."⁹ The messenger suggests the dispatch of a Ukrainian, like Stepan, who serves the tsar loyally and, simultaneously, respects the Ukrainian custom. Stepan explains that a Ukrainian will never attain the voyevoda post. He has learned that the Ukrainians are not trusted, that they serve appointments only in insignificant delegations, and then, only in accompaniment of Muscovites. The Cossack advises that it is this mistrust that is causing friction in Ukraine. Stepan is then appalled at the Cossack's information that many Ukrainians are deserting to Petro Doroshenko¹⁰ and that Oksana's brother, Ivan, has delivered a banner to Chyhyryn. The banner, moreover, has been sewn by the

⁸One of the Pereyaslav Articles of 1659 stipulated the stationing of Muscovite voyevody (military governors) and garrisons (which were to be maintained by the Ukrainian population) in five cities in Ukraine. A renewal of the Articles in 1665 resulted in a complete loss of Ukrainian administrative and financial independence--Muscovite voyevody obtained direct rule in many Ukrainian cities and Ukrainian taxes were deposited in the tsar's treasury.

⁹L. Ukrayinka, Boyarynya, p. 134. The voyevody abused their unlimited powers and enriched themselves at the expense of the people.

¹⁰Doroshenko's political program aimed at the creation of an independent, united Ukraine. He was elected hetman of Ukraine in Chyhyryn in 1666 and liberated the Right Bank of Ukraine from Poland. In 1668 Doroshenko entered the Left Bank and, thus for a short while, Ukraine was united under one hetman.

sorority of which Oksana was formerly a member.

On the guest's departure Stepan promises to forward the petition "at the right time." When the tsar is "under the influence of liquor," Stepan will sing, joke, tell nonsensical stories, dance for him, and do anything to "acquire something . . . for Ukraine."¹¹ The Cossack reminds Stepan that if the petition goes unheeded, then "the shedding of brothers' blood will be unavoidable."¹²

This scene, in unveiling the social-political affairs in Ukraine and the consequences thereof, crystallizes the basic question of the drama--Muscovite alliance has developed into Muscovite suzerainty. Even though Stepan is aware of the chauvinism, oppression and corruption of the tsarist colonial administration, his ideas stand unwavering. He maintains that an uprising against foreign rule in Ukraine would mean a fratricidal war and that "the oath" is all-important. Conversely, his Cossack friend, as many others who had supported the Muscovite alliance, cannot continue to respect that alliance which infringes upon Ukrainian rights. One begins to wonder why Stepan is so loyal and how much "strength and honor" he attaches to the base duties that he performs before the tsar.

The second scene of the third act, for a moment, reflects two sunbeams on Oksana's prison-like existence. The first consists of a letter from a former sorority friend who requests financial aid for an urgent matter, and the second consists of Stepan's news regarding

¹¹L. Ukrayinka, Boyarynya, pp. 136-137.

¹²Ibid., p. 137.

P. Doroshenko. Both sunbeams vanish immediately as Stepan's views re-emerge, and Stepan tries to appal Oksana about the affairs in Ukraine:

Come to your senses!
You were so afraid of bloodshed,
and this war is especially fratricidal
that Doroshenko has instigated in Ukraine--
why, he has even won the Tatars to his aid
and is paying them with Christian captives.¹³

But Oksana recognizes no difference between Tatarian and Muscovite fetters. She begins to express her hatred for Muscovy and its social system, yet, in compassion for her husband she regains control:

. . . As if I don't know
that my poor darling suffers
most of all--and I have to inflict
even more grief upon him!¹⁴

When Oksana asks her husband whether they will ever escape their bondage Stepan reassures her that he will request a leave of absence from Muscovy when the affairs in Ukraine subside and that presently he cannot leave because he must defend the petition from Ukraine. He bids his wife not to have any contact or correspondence with anyone from Ukraine, including her family, lest she and Stepan should be taken to task for uncertain dealings with her friends and thus lose everything, "our and the common cause together."¹⁵

¹³Ibid., p. 138. In 1674 a Cossack-Muscovite army (Left Bank) crossed into the Right Bank. Doroshenko, with Turkish help, forced their retreat.

¹⁴L. Ukrayinka, Boyarynya, p. 138.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 139.

This scene marks the real beginning of a social-psychological drama of the tragic heroine, Oksana. Her problems broaden and intensify. Oksana now fully realizes the complete lack of individual freedom, the prison-like existence, her husband's servitude and the dominance of fear in the Muscovite society. As she changes her ideological viewpoint, Oksana is caught between the role of a loving, compassionate, obedient boyar's wife and the role of a woman who is sympathetic to the Ukrainian cause as promulgated by P. Doroshenko.

ACT IV

The social-psychological drama of the tragic heroes is accentuated throughout the fourth, peripetal act. It is the day following Stepan's visit to the tsar. Stepan tells Oksana of the insincerity, insobriety and discord at the soiree, and that, in regard to the petition, the tsar had only uttered his usual remark: 'we will read it through and think about it for awhile.'¹⁶ Stepan, deeply worried about the consequences of his failure in defending the petition, seeks a consoling conversation that would divert his mind from politics, until his wife, who can no longer contain her own despair, exclaims:

Stepan! Can it really be that you do not¹⁷ see?
I am dying, withering, I cannot live like this.

Tender moments follow when Stepan decides that he must no longer ruin Oksana's life, that he must allow her to return to Ukraine. Oksana

¹⁶Ibid., p. 141.

¹⁷Ibid., pp. 142-143.

does not want to leave without him, she suggests that they all abandon the "Muscovite goods" and flee, in search for freedom, to Ukraine, or even to Poland or Wallachia. An escape to Ukraine is out of the question, however. Stepan has fears of being recaptured there and of endangering Oksana's family. He believes that an escape further West would only be an exchanging of one alien country for another, that in another foreign country, as in Muscovy, they would "beg" like "wanderers" and that he would be earning the "neighbor's good graces" by betraying Muscovy. When Oksana snaps: "Muscovy deserves it!",¹⁸ Stepan continues to maintain that "an oath . . . is an important matter," and that the "tsar will not return the oath" to him; finally the tragic hero concedes:

And I also cannot return to him
all that I have accepted from his hand.¹⁹

Silence falls. Words are supplemented by dusk's settling and by a soft ringing of a distant church bell. At last Oksana suggests that they never discuss this matter again, and on Stepan's request she attempts to sing. Her voice breaks. She complains of a "heavy chest" and begins to cough.

Thus in this scene Oksana discovers not only that she and her husband will remain in their shackles but, also, that Stepan has received much reward for wearing them. It is evident, too, that the life that Oksana must lead is destroying her health.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 144.

¹⁹Ibid.

The climax of the fourth act is in the next scene which begins with Mother's and Hanna's return from a shopping spree; Mother and Hanna have purchased expensive imported material. On their entrance, Oksana controls her cough and begins to simulate happiness. Both express their gratification that Oksana is not in her usual depressed state. " . . . And why should you grieve?" remarks Mother, "You are young people . . . there's harmony in the house" Oksana quickly picks up the cue: "And goods beyond the house" ²⁰ Mother and Hanna are oblivious of this irony, which is directed at Stepan's materialistic gains. Oksana declares that, tomorrow, she will "buy all of Muscovy" and when Stepan consents that she may purchase a brocaded headdress, Oksana, by dynamic song and dance, feigns extreme gaiety until at last her singing breaks into hysterical laughter and the laughter breaks into a serious cough.

The three songs that Oksana chooses to sing are climactic sarcasms. She does not sing any one in its entirety but only inasmuch as it functions in delivering a piercing message to Stepan. The phrase that is sung first, literally, says: "May my life be as long as is my husband good." ²¹ This is a rebuff to Stepan's consent on Oksana's purchasing of a fancy headdress. Stepan, who acquired monetary reward for bearing his shackles, agrees to reward Oksana with luxurious material goods for bearing hers. Since Oksana would rather die than live in bondage she wishes a short existence and the length of this, her desired existence, she compares with the depth of

²⁰Ibid., p. 145.

²¹Ibid., p. 146.

her husband's virtue.

The ironic refrain which Oksana sings next is also aimed at Stepan's acquisition of material goods:

Do not fear, dear mother, do not fear,
Put on the fancy red boots,
So that your heel-taps would clink,
So that our enemies would be silent!²²
hoo-hoo!

In other words, as long as Stepan is provided with material goods he will silence the enemy and as long as the enemy remains silent Stepan will acquire his luxuries: therefore, in regard to material well-being there is nothing to "fear." The fancy red boots with the heel-taps of fine metal suggest not only their quality but a domineering wearer, like Stepan, who is even capable of silencing the enemy. The enemy signifies anyone who interferes with the acquisition of these goods, in this case the Ukrainian supplicants who have signed the petition. The final exclamation "hoo-hoo!" which imitates a weeping sound may symbolize Oksana's outcry at Stepan's ignobleness.

Oksana's final refrain refers to her own fate:

Dance, dance, mistress of the household,
Let our sorrow perish,
Whether it perishes, or does not perish,²³
Dance, dance mistress of the household!

Oksana feels that she must dance in the face of sorrow and endeavor to conquer that sorrow, even though she knows that it will not be overpowered by dance. "And what about you, Stepan?", she then calls out, "help to sing!"²⁴ This remark is another pinprick, by it

²²Ibid.

²³Ibid.

²⁴Ibid.

Oksana insinuates that singing will help Stepan's sorrow perish just as it will help hers. The violent cough that follows is an indication that her physical tragedy is imminent.

ACT V

The final act of Boyarynya is composed of three short scenes. The first two, a prelude to the culmination, convey that Oksana is seriously ill and that her illness has been diagnosed as nostalgia. The third scene conveys that Hetman Doroshenko has suffered defeat and Ukraine has fallen under Muscovite rule.²⁵ The culmination of the drama lies in Oksana's and Stepan's self-reproachful speeches. It begins with Oksana's upbraiding of Stepan when he tries to reassure her that he will be able to obtain a leave of absence because things have "calmed down in Ukraine."²⁶ Oksana expresses her astonishment that Stepan interprets Ukraine's total defeat and ruin as a subsiding of affairs, or "peace," and that he, after his passive existence in his "Muscovite inglenook," dares to appear in Ukraine when the battle is over. Stepan again reminds Oksana that she once respected the hand which was untainted with blood. Oksana does not deny this and she admits that they did fear bloodshed, Tatars, the rack, perjury and Muscovite spies but that they did not give a thought about the consequences, about "what will be, when all calms down."²⁷ Oksana feels that although their hands are free of blood

²⁵ Doroshenko suffered his final defeat in 1676.

²⁶ L. Ukrayinka, Boyarynya, p. 150.

²⁷ Ibid., p. 151.

they are covered with rust. She compares her husband and herself to a rusty sabre affixed to its rusty scabbard:

At father's there was such a sabre . . .
 he misplaced it . . . my brother and I
 found it . . . we wanted to play war . . .
 we didn't draw it out . . . it was affixed to the
 scabbard . . .
 rusted . . . And so you and I . . .
 grown together, as the sabre with the scabbard . . .
 forever . . .
 both rusty . . . 28

This analogy conveys that Oksana believes that Stepan and she, "the sabre and the scabbard," are "rusty," or useless. When Stepan remarks that her words are cutting, Oksana advises that when he remarries he should take a Muscovite, not a Ukrainian girl, because Muscovite women are "timid, they fear."²⁹ At last, when Stepan begs her to have pity on him and on herself, Oksana confesses:

I pitied too much . . . therein lies my grief . . .
 If I had the strength not to pity,
 then we would break away out of this yoke--
 and you would free yourself from rust . . .
 But this way, completely, not to oneself, nor to society!³⁰

This passage is the key to the understanding of the main problem of the drama, i.e. the social-psychological problem and personal tragedy of the heroes. Oksana believes that her pity for her husband is the cause of her incapacilities to exercise the necessary positive influence over him. Because of pity she has not been able to convince Stepan to abandon his base role and to join the active participants in his nation's affairs. Having realized her lack of influence, Oksana

²⁸Ibid., pp. 151-152.

²⁹Ibid., p. 152.

³⁰Ibid.

feels that she is responsible for her husband's tragedy, his uselessness: like the rusty scabbard she has been unable to free the sabre to its duty and has caused the sabre's rustiness. In the subsequent dialogue, Oksana continues to express her feelings of worthlessness and self-contempt. She feels that she is no longer needed by anyone and that her husband has no reason for which to love her.

Oksana's tragedy lies not only in her own individual nature, however. It must be sought, primarily, in the nature of the Muscovite social system, for, in accordance with the Domostroy or Muscovite social code, Oksana experiences that which any boyar's wife, or any woman of the nobility and urban class in seventeenth-century Muscovy experienced--a complete lack of freedom, fear of punishment as the dominant factor of life, and female seclusion and impotence.³¹ Oksana simply cannot live in this atmosphere. "And this Moscow is repulsive to me,"³² she cries out in despair. "I am dying, withering, I cannot live like this!"³³ Her doctor advises that if she returns to Ukraine she might still recover.³⁴ It is known that many Muscovite women of the nobility either fled or committed serious acts of violence to escape the rigid Domostroy³⁵ and so Oksana wanted to escape, but she

³¹See E. Elnett, Historic Origin and Social Development of Family Life in Russia (New York: Columbia University Press, 1926), pp. 27-45; and F. W. Halle, Women in Soviet Russia (New York: Viking Press, 1935), pp. 9-12.

³²L. Ukrayinka, Boyarynya, p. 138.

³³Ibid., pp. 142-143.

³⁴Ibid., p. 149.

³⁵See Elnett, Historic Origin . . ., pp. 27-45.

chose to remain, until death, by the side of her beloved. In the above-mentioned passage, she expresses her deep regret that she did not convince Stepan to escape.

Stepan, too, in his culminating speech, issues a confession about their inertia:

And why reproach yourself with words, my love?
 Fate has already punished us so heavily
 that surely even God will forgive all our sins.
 Some wiped blood from wounds,
 but we, from our hearts.
 Some were exiled, locked in prisons,
 but we carried invisible chains.
 Some had moments of fortune in battle
 but a heavy horrible nightmare suffocated us,
 and we were not imparted with the strength
 to overpower that nightmare . . . ³⁶

The contrasts herein serve to identify active participation in the battle in Ukraine, and the passive reactions of Stepan and Oksana, who, although concerned about their national affairs, were unable to offer aid. Stepan admits that he and Oksana were incapable of conquering the "heavy horrible nightmare" which bound them to their destiny. This nightmare or motive force, which entered the drama at the very outset and remained throughout, is fear--the dominant factor in Muscovite life.

Oksana believes that this bitter lesson that Stepan and she have learned must become their testament to their family and friends, and that only by death can their suffering be proven and made understood. She requests that Stepan deliver this testament after her death. On Stepan's words that it would be better if he spoke thus

³⁶ L. Ukrayinka, Boyarynya, p. 153.

of dying, Oksana concludes:

No, love, you are needed more in the world,
 For you there is still something about which and
 someone about whom to care.
 You were not born a fighter, but after battle
 you will be able to provide relief to the vanquished,
 as you have often done before . . . On the battlefield
 everyone did not die, there are many wounded . . .
 you will help them to regain their strength, then, maybe
 sometime there . . . in having again assembled for battle,
 they will remember you with a kind word . . .
 and even if not--do not regret that you helped.³⁷

Oksana no longer advises Stepan to return to Ukraine, for how can he show his face there now that the battle is over? He was "not born a fighter" and he cannot overcome his fear, but Oksana wants Stepan to be useful in the existing unfortunate situation. Even if Ukraine has fallen under Muscovite domination, Stepan, in his boyar position, can help to provide rehabilitative measures for his country and thus aid Ukraine to recover and reassemble for battle. In having done so, Stepan will have re-established respect from his nation, or, at least, his self-respect.

In summary, the two lines of action in Boyarynya may be unravelled for clarity. In regard to Stepan, the exposition discloses that, although he is a boyar, Stepan fears his fellow boyars, that he has no freedom of movement in Ukraine and no freedom in Muscovy. His appreciation of the life in Ukraine and his love for his homeland are especially evident in the love scene. The Ukrainian bride that he wishes to take to Muscovy is not only the girl whom he dearly loves but is the symbol of the freedom and of

³⁷Ibid.

the beauty of his homeland.

The basic question or theme of the drama is set forth in the ideological clash between Stepan and Ivan. Whereas Ivan believes in Ukraine's armed struggle against both foreign intruders, Muscovite and Polish, Stepan believes that national objectives can be achieved in a Ukrainian-Muscovite alliance against Poland. Stepan sincerely believes in the ideals promulgated by religion, the school, and his father that fratricidal warfare is evil and that cooperative foreign relations can be effective. As his father and as Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky, he approves the alliance with Muscovy out of respect for the Greek Orthodox religion. He feels that it is his duty, as a boyar, to win the tsar's good graces for those Ukrainians who are oppressed by Poland.

The second part of the drama shows how Stepan attempts to accomplish his purpose. In the hope of gaining the tsar's favor for Ukraine and in the fear that any misdemeanor on his part may hurt the Ukrainian cause, Stepan fully accepts and completely fulfills his ascribed social and political role according to the expectations of the Muscovite society in which he dwells. He commands his wife to conform likewise.

The complication emerges when the Muscovite alliance develops into drastic Muscovite rule and the hero must defend the petition from Ukraine. The hero does not succeed in his representative political endeavor and the consequence of his failure is an uprising in a disunited Ukraine. After the turning point, i.e.

after Stepan's failure and his full realization that he cannot accomplish that which he has set out to accomplish, the drama moves toward its resolution--national strength and personal honor are not acquired by passive obedience to the subjugator of one's nation. Stepan relates the sufferings that he and Oksana have had to bear in their passive and abjectly submissive role and explains that they were incapable of abandoning this role because their will was not strong enough to overpower their fear of the subjugator.

The exposition in the second line of action, which embraces the heroine, reveals that Oksana upholds the same ideological viewpoint as does Stepan. Together the tragic heroes will endeavor to accomplish Stepan's purpose. This line of action sets forth an additional question for resolution, whether Oksana, who has been raised in a freedom-loving society, could maintain a happy home in Muscovy as a boyar's wife. In virtue of the same religious faith in Muscovy as in Ukraine and of the linguistic relationship between Muscovite and Ukrainian, Oksana is certain that this can be. But in Muscovy, Oksana soon discovers the meaning of a dictatorial political and social structure. In due course her ideological viewpoint changes and she is faced with opposing obligations--obligations to her husband, who desires to but cannot break his political affiliation, and obligations to her nation.

In her love and compassion for her husband, Oksana chooses to continue to function as a passive, obedient wife accordant with the societal norms of Muscovy. As the Doroshenko revolt rages in Ukraine, Stepan and Oksana sit by idly. Their inactivity causes the

progression of Oksana's illness and when Ukraine suffers defeat, Oksana, who has not fulfilled any obligation, domestic or social, loses her desire to live. Oksana bitterly scolds Stepan for his stagnancy. Nevertheless she blames herself for his passive role because she did not fulfill an important function as his wife. She allowed pity to paralyze her power of influence and for that reason could not convince her husband to abandon his meaningless career. Oksana believes that her incapacabilities are the cause of her husband's tragedy, his worthlessness. A recognition of her inadequacy produces within her a painful sense of failure, of self-devaluation, and of shame: she compares herself to the rusty scabbard that is unable to free the sword to its rightful duty and has therefore caused its rustiness too. This analogy is basic to the understanding of Oksana's psychological tragedy, her self-contempt: the Muscovite social system, in crushing freedom and practicing fear and terror, plays the important role in generating this tragedy.

Oksana's physical tragedy demonstrates that a freedom-loving individual or nation cannot survive in a social and political dictatorship and Oksana's symptoms of tuberculosis may symbolize that Ukraine, or any other country, would not be able to flourish or fruitfully survive, but would progressively decay, within an autocratic government. Her physical and spiritual ruin, which ends in death, symbolizes the physical and spiritual "Ruin" of Ukraine and the fatal blow that Ukraine received on Doroshenko's defeat.

The torment of guilt that the tragic heroes have known in their passive existence in Muscovy becomes a lesson in Oksana's testament to her family and friends. She advises Stepan, who should not show his face in Ukraine when the battle is over, to utilize his post in attaining rehabilitative advantages for Ukraine, for she is optimistic that, when Ukraine recovers, the Ukrainians will reunite and reassemble for battle against foreign rule and that, in having helped, Stepan will have once more acquired feelings of worth.

This scene-by-scene survey establishes that Boyarynya is the story of a boyar and his wife who are caught in a strangling web of inactivity during a rapid march of crucial historical events, because they are bound in the fetters of an alien socio-political system. It contains two interwoven lines of action: (1) the tragedy of a boyar's wife who comes to realize the ignobleness of her husband's pacifist ideology and career but, because of her personal nature--her succumbing to pity, and because of the totalitarian nature of the societal code, has no power to influence him out of his state of inertia, and (2) the tragedy of a boyar whose will to act collides with a stronger force--fear. It resolves the theme that the musket and the sword do have more strength and honor than the pen and a sincere word.

The drama is inclusive thematically. Besides the ideological aspect inherent in the basic theme it encompasses historical, political, sociological, psychological and, most important, social-psychological aspects. In the historical aspect of

Boyarynya, the playwright punctuates the negative consequences of national disunity, of foreign allegiance and foreign rule in Ukraine and of Bohdan Khmelnytsky's alliance with Muscovy. She castigates passivity in national affairs and the placing of personal interests above the national.

By the political aspect L. Ukrayinka scorns the autocratic form of government in Muscovy, the inefficient, chauvinistic, oppressive and corrupt tsarist colonial administration, as well as the low morale of the tsar's court and its despicable method of reviewing state affairs. In the sociological aspect lies L. Ukrayinka's contempt for the Muscovite social system--for the absolute lack of freedom in that society, for its utilization of fear, for the rigid patriarchal norm of the Domostroy and the inferior status that it allotted to women. The psychological aspect demonstrates how the psychological forces, fear and pity, can overwhelm two individuals. In the case of the hero, this aspect reveals how fear can paralyze an individual to torturous inaction and eventually lead to a loss of self-respect. It shows the problems of a marginal man³⁸ who is caught in two antagonistic roles--the role of the man who presents himself in a

³⁸Robert E. Park identified the marginal man as the one who is "living and sharing intimately in the cultural life and traditions of two distinct peoples, never quite willing to break, even if he were permitted to do so, with his past and his traditions, and not quite accepted, because of racial prejudice, in the new society in which he now seeks to find a place." [Stepan seeks to find this place to attain favoritism for his nation.] In Everett V. Stonequist, "The Problem of the Marginal Man," Social Problems in America, E. Briant Lee and A. McLung Lee (eds.) (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1955), p. 367, citing "Human Migration and the Marginal Man," American Journal of Sociology, XXXIII (1927-1928), p. 882.

boyar's attire as opposed to the role of the man who is Ukrainian in spirit. In the case of the heroine, the psychological aspect portrays the fate of a woman who is torn between the duty to her husband and an opposing duty to her nation. It demonstrates the importance of a woman's role in aiding her husband to acquire feelings of worthiness and a favorable self-image.

Boyarynya is essentially a social-psychological tragedy, for above all it brilliantly illustrates the effect of a society on two individuals. Fear that rules supreme in a totalitarian society engenders the individual problems that result in a tragic loss of social and self-respect.

Boyarynya is allegorical. It reflects the problems of disunity, dangerous conciliation and passivity in Ukraine of the playwright's day. But its allegorical nature extends Boyarynya into a wider, universal sphere, wherever such problems exist. The conflict between pacifist and revolutionist ideologies that is set forth and resolved in the drama is a conflict that has existed since time immemorial. Every aspect that the drama contains can be transferred from the Ukrainian and Muscovite scenes to other territories, for L. Ukrayinka's castigation of disunity, yokes, autocracy, totalitarianism and passivity is general. The Muscovite socio-political system can represent any totalitarian society, while Stepan and Oksana are but representative individuals of such a society. Fear and pity are abiding elements of human nature, and the standards of self-evaluation, in terms of adequacy and worthiness, are universal human yardsticks. Thus the human souls that are beneath the boyar's and the boyarynya's costumes are eternal and eternally the same.

Boyarynya, moreover, can be interpreted as a symbolic play.

Oksana may well be the epitome of Ukraine. Wed to her genius Khmelnytsky, the het'mansha (hetman's wife) accepts his conciliatory views and falls under Muscovite domination. They realize their error and aspire to throw their yoke asunder, but the hetman's fear of the mighty autocrat does not allow him to break his political affiliation. The het'mansha, because of her deep love, respect, and compassion for her hetman, is unable to induce him to act. Finally their spiritual son, Doroshenko, struggles for liberation, but family disunity, outside intrusion, and Doroshenko's ultimate defeat result in Ukraine's physical and spiritual ruin. She lies in state at Muscovy's feet. Before her death Khmelnytsky had admitted his guilt and had hoped that, because he had endured unendurable anguish for his political action, he would receive even divine forgiveness for his great sin. In view of the hetman's previous deeds Ukraine can forgive him. She is optimistic that, in time, her spiritual descendants will rise in unity and liberate themselves from their Avernus.

But, even if one contends that this drama is nationally symbolic, it cannot be denied that it is, at the same time, universally symbolic, for the symbolism therein can be removed to various other soils and can be traced in the histories of other nations. Thus Boyarynya is L. Ukrayinka's appeal not only to her countrymen, but an appeal to any oppressed people, of any age, to unite and rise against their oppressors.

CHAPTER III

BOYARYNYA IN LITERARY CRITICISM

L. Ukrayinka wrote Boyarynya in Helwan, Egypt, April 27th to 29th, 1910. In 1914, one year after the death of its author, the work made its first appearance in the periodical Ridny kray¹ which was edited by the author's mother, Olena Pchilka, in Hadyach, Ukraine.² Four years later Boyarynya appeared in a book form in Katerynoslav.³ There seems to have been no immediate literary reaction to the drama and, as far as it is known, the book edition received but one critical review. "The play is . . . in soft gentle tones," wrote V. Strashkevych, the author of this review, "in reading it creates an impression but . . . in performance it seems . . . that a lack of scenic action would be felt."⁴

¹Lesya Ukrayinka, Tvory (New York: Tyshchenko and Bilous Publishing Co., 1954), Vol. VIII, footnote to Boyarynya, p. xlii. (This edition is an offset reproduction of L. Ukrayinka's Tvory, edited by B. Yakubs'ky, 12 vols.; Kiev: Knyhospilka, 1927-1930.) Cited hereafter as L. Ukrayinka, Tvory, New York edition. Cf. Anatol' I. Kostenko (ed.), Spohady pro Lesyu Ukrayinku (Kiev: Radyans'ky pys'mennyk, 1963), p. 433, footnote 11; and Leonid Bilets'ky, Try syl'vetky (Winnipeg: Soyuz Ukrayinok Kanady, 1951), p. 123.

²Mykola Zerov, Do dzherel (Krakiv-L'viv: Ukrayins'ke vydavnytstvo, 1943), p. 150; and Hanna Mandryka, Vybrane (Winnipeg: Komitet Ukrayinok Kanady, 1962), p. 54.

³L. Ukrayinka, Tvory, New York edition, Vol. VIII, p. xlii; and Kostenko (ed.), Spohady . . ., p. 433.

⁴Mykhaylo Dray-Khmara, "Boyarynya," in L. Ukrayinka, Tvory, New York edition, Vol. VIII, p. 87, citing V. Strashkevych, Knyhar, No. 10 (1918), p. 604. Dray-Khmara's essay is probably the only work on Boyarynya that appeared in Ukraine. It was written between 1928 and 1930. The introduction to his essay consists of a review of the earliest responses to the drama. The original comments by Strashkevych,

Eventually other scholars responded to the drama but, according to Mykhaylo Dray-Khmara, their responses, too, were apathetic.

O. K. Doroshkevych but mentioned the work in his textbook of the history of Ukrainian literature.⁵ M. Zerov described Boyarynya as "warm" and "sincere," and believed that the dramatist wrote it without "special studies" and that she "skilfully and easily mastered" aspects of Ukrainian life as "material for her problems and tasks."⁶

A. Muzychka underscored the play's nostalgia motif which he thought was inspired by the dramatist's nostalgia during her sojourn in Egypt.⁷ M. Dray-Khmara included a brief characterization of Boyarynya in his book on L. Ukrayinka⁸ and B. V. Yakubsky and V. Vasylenko commented on the Ukrainian theme in the drama. Yakubsky stated that its Ukrainian theme makes Boyarynya an exception in L. Ukrayinka's dramatic works and that it was probably prompted by the criticisms that the author had received for avoiding such themes. Without recognizing the

Muzychka, Yakubsky and Vasylenko are inaccessible to us, while Zerov and Doroshkevych are confirmed but in different publications than those cited by Dray-Khmara.

⁵Dray-Khmara, "Boyarynya," p. 87. He is referring to the 1924 edition. Cf. O. K. Doroshkevych, Pidruchnyk istoriyi ukrayins'koyi literatury (Kiev, 1927), pp. 242, 272. Boyarynya is mentioned only as a drama that contains a national problem.

⁶Dray-Khmara, "Boyarynya," p. 87, citing M. Zerov from Lesya Ukrayinka, Tvory (Kiev, 1924), Vol. I, p. liv. Cf. Zerov, Do dzherel, p. 178.

⁷Dray-Khmara, "Boyarynya," pp. 87-88, citing A. Muzychka, Lesya Ukrayinka, yiyi zhyttya, hromads'ka diyal'nist' i poetychna tvorchist' (O[desa], 1925), p. 88.

⁸Dray-Khmara, "Boyarynya," p. 88, referring to his own book on Lesya Ukrayinka, Zhyttya y tvorchist' (Kiev, 1926), pp. 132-133.

symbolic aspects of the play, Yakubsky explained that the historical, rather than contemporary, plot in Boyarynya and the general absence of Ukrainian subjects in L. Ukrayinka's dramatic creativity was "probably" due to her "lack of a good acquaintance with" and "certain distance from Ukrainian life because of illness which did not allow her to participate in this life or forced her . . . to faraway resorts."⁹

Vasylenko, in comparing Boyarynya with other poetic dramas of L. Ukrayinka, wrote that the dramatist was more successful in reproducing motives of exotic subjects that provided her with the freedom to work with her original ideas--ideas that were difficult to apply to concrete, realistic images of her epoch because of the political atmosphere.¹⁰

The earliest accessible essay on Boyarynya is that of Mykhaylo Dray-Khmara.¹¹ Although his study is quite extensive, the author, for the most part, evades a discussion of the drama. The two motives in Boyarynya, writes Dray-Khmara, are passive national betrayal as represented mainly by Stepan and nostalgia as manifested in Oksana. The author does not examine these motives but names other Ukrainian literary figures who wrote on them and discusses the consistent development of these motives in L. Ukrayinka's literary heritage.¹²

⁹Dray-Khmara, "Boyarynya," p. 88, citing B. Yakubs'ky from Lesya Ukrayinka, Tvory (Kiev, 1927), Vol. I, p. lxxv.

¹⁰Dray-Khmara, "Boyarynya," p. 88, citing V. Vasylenko, "Motyvy tvorchosty Lesi Ukrayinky," Krytyka, No. 8 (19[2]8), pp. 71-72.

¹¹Dray-Khmara, "Boyarynya," pp. 87-109.

¹²Ibid., pp. 98-101.

Dray-Khmara observes other works in Ukrainian literature that are dedicated to the same historical period as is Boyarynya,¹³ the historical facts reflected in the drama,¹⁴ the playwright's possible utilization of M. Kostomarov's historical works,¹⁵ and the literary sources from which she might have drawn.¹⁶ The important analogy in Boyarynya, which compares the main characters to a rusty sabre and sheath, is not discussed from the viewpoint of the drama but from the viewpoint of its recurrence in L. Ukrayinka's works,¹⁷ and the psychological aspect of the play which "conceals the historical" is underscored with but one sentence.¹⁸

The essential part of Dray-Khmara's essay consists of an attempt at an allegorical analysis of Boyarynya.¹⁹ The author rightly believes that the drama can be transferred into any epoch. But in the personage of Stepan the author sees a corrupt representative of the Ukrainian intelligentsia of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries who renounced his culture for a foreign one and

¹³Ibid., pp. 82-92.

¹⁴Ibid., pp. 101-107.

¹⁵Ibid. Dray-Khmara places too much emphasis on the dramatist's reliance on Kostomarov. She used various historical sources, including Mykhaylo Hrushevsky's works. See letter from L. Ukrayinka to A. Kryms'ky, May 24, 1912 in Lesya Ukrayinka, Tvory v desyaty tomakh, Oleh Babyshkin (ed.) (Kiev: Vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oyi literatury, 1963-1965), Vol. X, p. 334. Cited hereafter as L. Ukrayinka, Tvory, Kiev edition.

¹⁶Dray-Khmara, "Boyarynya," pp. 107-108.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 108.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 101.

¹⁹Ibid., pp. 96-98.

who, for personal interests, betrayed Ukrainian traditions and voluntarily took on the foreign yoke. Somehow in the personage of Oksana he sees an active Ukrainian intellect who struggled for national autonomy but who, in having fallen into the "claws of . . . Moscow's officialdom," had no strength to escape and finally perished on foreign soil.

In regard to the dramatist's views, Dray-Khmara writes that, even if the historical battle is not reproduced in Boyarynya, L. Ukrayinka's reaction to the battle reveals her national consciousness, her commiseration for its participants, her esteem for Hetman Doroshenko, and her sympathies to the national ideals of unity and autonomy.²⁰ In the personage of Oksana, adds the author, L. Ukrayinka uncovers her own feelings--her hatred toward Muscovy and her sympathy to Hetman Doroshenko. These feelings, he says, the dramatist could have received under the influence of M. Kostomarov.²¹ But surely, in view of her exceptional childhood rearing, L. Ukrayinka must have formulated her opinions about Moscow and the said hetman long before she read the historical works of M. Kostomarov. Her parents, her uncle M. Drahomaniv, her personal friends M. Lysenko, M. Starytsky, and I. Franko, and the works of T. Shevchenko, amongst others, had a much more profound influence on the poetess.

The author states that L. Ukrayinka developed exotic themes in answer to the popular demand and then contradicts himself to say, as did Yakubsky, that her Ukrainian themes are an answer to the

²⁰Ibid., p. 95.

²¹Ibid., pp. 95-96.

critics who reproached her for avoiding such themes. More recent writers, like L. Biletsky and K. Siehs, have also adopted the latter idea; but neither statement can be true because L. Ukrayinka continued to draw from foreign sources even after she had written Boyarynya, because she did not publish this drama, and because she paid no heed to her unpopularity with the critics: " . . . I am never offended when my work is judged," she wrote, "I, only, don't like the criticism ad hominem. . . ." ²² Furthermore, a letter by L. Ukrayinka reveals that she had a written, though incomplete, plan of Boyarynya in about 1895, ²³ before she even began to write drama. Dray-Khmara, as did Muzychka and some recent writers, declares that L. Ukrayinka's residence in Egypt and a consequent nostalgia prompted Ukrainian themes. But the dramatist travelled abroad before 1910, and nostalgia had not prompted these themes in her earlier dramas; moreover, her later plays, which were written abroad, again draw on foreign sources. It is important, however, that the Ukraine for which she yearned throughout her life was not the colonial one where her home was located but an autonomous Ukraine. In 1895, while L. Ukrayinka lived in Bulgaria, she had written in a letter:

Shame and sorrow for my country simply torments me.
 . . . I don't know what I'll do in having returned [home] to
 Russia, the very thought of this [that] prisonlike existence

²²Letter from L. Ukrayinka to O. Makovey, May 28, 1893, in L. Ukrayinka, Tvory, Kiev edition, Vol. IX, p. 125.

²³Letter from L. Ukrayinka to A. Kryms'ky, October 14, 1911, in L. Ukrayinka, Tvory, Kiev edition, Vol. X, p. 319.

dessicates my heart. . . . I cannot bear the subjugated life in silence.²⁴

Since the dramatist's ideas about Boyarynya began to foment at this time, less emphasis should be placed on the nostalgia motif in the drama.

In another contradiction, Dray-Khmara, as did Yakubsky, states that the playwright developed a historical theme in Boyarynya because she was not well acquainted with Ukrainian life. In his immediate discussion Dray-Khmara refutes his own statement thrice: (1) in his mention of L. Ukrayinka's works which depict Ukrainian life, (2) in his allegorical analysis, and (3) in his statement that "she knew well the psychology of the people" who lived in the epoch portrayed in Boyarynya, for in the drama she "depicted that which she saw and heard."²⁵

L. Ukrayinka's entire life and literary heritage is a witness of her thorough knowledge and understanding of the Ukraine of her day.

Dray-Khmara's study does not aid in the understanding of Boyarynya. A careful scrutiny of this essay, however, suggests that its mediocrity should perhaps be attributed to the conditions under which the author, a Soviet citizen, had to write.

In addition to the above comments two other early works contain passing references to the drama. In his essay on L. Ukrayinka's drama Yohanna zhinka Khusova (Joanna, The Wife of Khusa), B. Yakubsky discusses the problems of love, marriage, the woman's role, and the

²⁴Letter from L. Ukrayinka to M. Pavlyk, April, 1895, in L. Ukrayinka, Tvory, Kiev edition, Vol. IX, p. 223.

²⁵Dray-Khmara, "Boyarynya," p. 95.

emancipation of women in that drama and mentions Boyarynya as another example of L. Ukrayinka's works which contains these problems.²⁶

Oleksander Biletsky concludes that in Boyarynya

Lesya Ukrayinka highly esteems Hetman P. Doroshenko by representing him as a 'national hero' for his anti-Muscovite politics. In the portrait of Oksana, who must unwillingly live in Moscow.²⁷ she depicts a Ukrainian 'patriot'--a hater of Moscow.

In the West, Leonid Biletsky incorporates a description of Boyarynya in a study on L. Ukrayinka.²⁸ He introduces his summation of the drama by a contradiction that Boyarynya was a concession to critics and that, for unknown reasons, L. Ukrayinka did not admit to the existence of this work. The fact is, however, that the dramatist had discussed Boyarynya in two letters²⁹ which provide evidence that the play had been read by at least one of her friends. She also read and discussed the drama with her family in 1913,³⁰ thus she had admitted to its existence. If an answer is sought for the reason that she did not publish the work, then it can be postulated from

²⁶B. Yakubs'ky, "Yohanna zhinka Khusova," in L. Ukrayinka, Tvory, New York edition, Vol. VIII, p. 45. This work was written between 1927 and 1930.

²⁷Petro Odarchenko, "Lesya Ukrayinka v radyans'kiy literaturniy krytytsi," Suchasnist', No. 4 [28] (April, 1963), p. 59, citing O. Bilets'ky from his afterword to Vybrani tvory Lesi Ukrayinky, 1936.

²⁸In L. Bilets'ky, Try syl'vetky, pp. 75-127. See pp. 123-124.

²⁹Letters from L. Ukrayinka to A. Kryms'ky, Oct. 14, 1911 and May 24, 1912, in L. Ukrayinka, Tvory, Kiev edition, Vol. X, pp. 318-321 and pp. 333-336 respectively.

³⁰B. Yakubs'ky, footnote to Boyarynya, in L. Ukrayinka, Tvory, New York edition, Vol. VIII, p. xlii.

L. Ukrayinka's correspondence. Her letter of October 14th, 1911, for example, touches upon the subjective elements in Boyarynya.

As for Oksana . . . life gave . . . hints for her drama, but only hints; and here, more than anywhere else, come to mind Sainte Beuve's words: "Le drama c'est une exagération à propos"; subjective elements are in it, but the final years are of little consequence (unless by that that they changed nothing in this direction), . . . 10, and 15, and 20 years ago she may have appeared in the world, but only in a somewhat different dress. . . .³¹

In light of her earlier correspondence and of her lyrics it is known that she refrained from direct autobiographism³² and that, as already mentioned, she did not like "the criticism ad hominem." Thus subjectivism in Boyarynya may be one reason why L. Ukrayinka preferred not to publish it. More important is that the playwright was not satisfied that the drama added something new to Ukrainian literature. In her letter of May 24, 1912, wherein L. Ukrayinka discusses the advantages of chronicles, she says that she desired to become acquainted with "the style, the 'fragrances' of ancient epochs" in order to be able to say something new, fresh and different from what other writers had said--something more than she had acquired from contemporary historians. "Now Boyarynya seems to be somewhat elementary, schwarz

³¹Letter to A. Kryms'ky, Oct. 14, 1911, p. 319.

³²Letter from L. Ukrayinka to I. Franko, Jan. 13, 1903, Tvory, Kiev edition, Vol. X, p. 103. " . . . I search always, in a poet's work, not for an autobiography . . . but something which would not concern him alone." For autobiographism in her lyrics see Hryhory Avrakhov, Khudozhnya maysternist' Lesi Ukrayinky: liryka (Kiev: Radyans'ka shkola, 1964), pp. 77-78. See also Oleh Babyshkin, "Z psykholohiyi tvorchosti Lesi Ukrayinky," Ukrayins'ka mova i literatura v shkoli, No. 10 (October, 1966), p. 7 and Oleh Babyshkin, "Mystets'ky svit Lesi Ukrayinky," in Lesya Ukrayinka, Pro mystetstvo (Kiev: Mystetstvo, 1966), pp. 28-29.

und weiss," she apologizes, "but surely, it would have been different if I would be better 'educated.'"³³ A third possible reason that the playwright did not publish this drama is that its revolutionary overtones would not have passed the censors. But, in view of the subjective elements in the play, it can be postulated that L. Ukrayinka, like her tragic heroine, regarded this drama as her last testament, which was to be delivered only after her death.

Quite similar to Dray-Khmara's opinion, and also without analysis, is L. Biletsky's comment that the two motives in the drama are: (1) national non-resistance to evil and betrayal as manifested in Stepan, and (2) passive yearning for the homeland as manifested in Oksana. He believes that the work reflects, on the one hand, the disloyalty of a great part of the Ukrainian intelligentsia and, on the other, the passive resistance and yearning for national self-reliance of the nationally conscious Ukrainian society. The following is his concise, but not precise, description of the story of Boyarynya:

A Ukrainian, Stepan, who lives in Moscow and who for faithful service to the tsar has been promoted to the boyar дума, married a well-known Ukrainian girl, Oksana. Oksana . . . in having moved to Moscow, could not become accustomed to and could not accept the alien Muscovite way of life and order. Her condition became tragic especially then, when she saw that her husband had broken from Ukraine entirely and had become Russified. [Oksana] . . . spiritually depressed, became ill and began to weaken spiritually and physically.³⁴

³³Letter to A. Kryms'ky, May 24, 1912, p. 334.

³⁴L. Bilets'ky, Try syl'vetky, p. 123.

There are three errors in this description. There is no indication in the drama that: (1) Stepan was promoted to the boyar дума for previous service to the tsar, and that (2) Stepan broke from Ukraine entirely and became Russified, therefore (3) Oksana's tragedy surely can not be caused by Stepan's renunciation of Ukraine and consequent Russification.

Subsequently, in reference to the dialogue between Oksana and Stepan in Act V,³⁵ L. Biletsky quotes two of Oksana's passages to prove that the dialogue reveals antagonizing viewpoints on social and national affairs. Yet, these passages do not give such an impression when they are placed back within their context and within the maze of problems set and resolved by the dramatist. Differing ideologies are best sought in the exposition in Act I, rather than in the resolving final act.

In evaluating the play, L. Biletsky observes that it is "a beautiful work, developed in soft tones. In reading, it creates a suitable mood of an impressionistic play."³⁶

Before the publication of L. Biletsky's study, Boyarynya appeared in an English metrical translation by Percival Cundy. In the introduction to his translations, Cundy's remarks on Boyarynya are very similar to those in the quote from L. Biletsky, emphasis is laid on a Russified Stepan who "finally awakes to the ties that still bind

³⁵L. Ukraïinka, Boyarynya, in Tvory, New York edition, Vol. VIII, p. 150. The dialogue which begins: "How do [did] you say? Calmed down?" and the passage which begins at the bottom of page 150.

³⁶L. Bilets'ky, Try syl'vetky, p. 124.

him to Ukraine, but by then it is too late."³⁷ The translation of the poetic drama, although somewhat declamatory, deserves merit. It contains a few errors, however. The term vyhovshchyna (the hetmanate of Ivan Vyhovsky) is translated "before the last revolt,"³⁸ sharakhvany, a dress worn by the women in Muscovy, is translated "pantaloons"³⁹ and the dramatist's references to Cherkasian, an inhabitant of the city of Cherkasy in Ukraine, are translated "Circassian."⁴⁰

Other Western scholars who touched on Boyarynya are Dmytro Dontsov, Petro Odarchenko, N. (Mykola Ohloblyn) Hlobenko, Karl Siehs and Volodymyr Radzykevych. A relatively lengthy study has been written by Roman Zadesnyansky. The most recent description of the drama is by Constantine Bida.

D. Dontsov mentions Boyarynya in his book on Olena Teliha.⁴¹ In having described this poetess and her concept of the woman's obligation to her nation and to her husband, the author concludes that her type of woman is found in the portrait of Oksana.⁴² But an examination

³⁷Percival Cundy, "Introduction," in Lesya Ukrainka, Spirit of Flame: A Collection of Works (New York: Bookman Associates, 1950), p. 32.

³⁸Cundy, "The Noblewoman," Spirit of Flame, p. 115.

³⁹Ibid., p. 129.

⁴⁰Ibid., pp. 127, 144, 152.

⁴¹Dmytro Dontsov, Poetka vohnyanykh mezh: Olena Teliha (Toronto: Homin Ukrayiny, 1953).

⁴²Ibid., p. 90.

of the works of O. Teliha⁴³ clarifies that Oksana is an exact anti-thesis to the woman found in these works. Unlike Oksana, O. Teliha boldly accepts the "blows" as well as the "gifts" of life.⁴⁴ She advises:

Do not fear days entangled in a knot,
Sleepless nights, hazy mornings,
Let time cut the face - with good and bad!
Let the most insignificant of mornings blaze the heart!⁴⁵

Nor does she "fold" her "hands" in the face of "danger"⁴⁶ as does Oksana:

Let the stormy waters carry me
From aspiration to the very deed.⁴⁷

As Oksana, O. Teliha is her husband's "calm and bright harbor"⁴⁸ but, unlike Oksana, she is the "soul-well" from which he draws his strength to "endeavor and hold on!"⁴⁹ Whereas only femininity is contained in Oksana, the fusion of femininity and masculinity occurs in O. Teliha, for although she possesses an "infinite amount of tenderness" whenever necessary O. Teliha tempers it into masculinity.⁵⁰ With a tender kiss she extinguishes the "firing hell" in the "eyes and thoughts" of her

⁴³O. Zhdanovych (ed.), Prapory dukha. Zhyttya i tvorchist' O. Teliha (n.p.: Surma, 1947).

⁴⁴Oleha Teliha, cited by Dontsov, Poetka . . ., p. 44.

⁴⁵Teliha, cited by Zhdanovych, Prapory dukha, p. 41.

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 30.

⁴⁷Teliha, cited by Dontsov, Poetka . . ., p. 39.

⁴⁸Teliha, cited by Zhdanovych, Prapory dukha, p. 28.

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 15.

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 16.

beloved but when the first trumpet sounds she herself decisively and courageously prepares him for battle and on departure arms him not with tears, but with "a kiss as sharp as a knife."⁵¹ O. Teliha will not succumb to female impotence as does Oksana; after having dispatched her husband to the trumpet's call, if need be, she will follow in his footsteps "even to the death."⁵² Oksana's tragedy lies in the fact that she was not this type of woman.

P. Odarchenko gave some attention to Boyarynya in three separate studies. In his foreword to L. Ukrayinka's works,⁵³ Odarchenko characterizes the poetic drama as an allegorical drama wherein L. Ukrayinka reproduces modern ideas and solves the most pertinent problems of her time.⁵⁴ He correctly asserts that the basic idea in the work is an uncompromising struggle against the enemy,⁵⁵ that with the brilliant images of Stepan and Oksana the dramatist shows the progressive disillusionment with the idea of a possible cooperation between Ukrainians and Muscovites, and that she develops and confirms the idea that Ukraine could be liberated from Moscow only in a decisive armed struggle.⁵⁶ Odarchenko believes that in Boyarynya L. Ukrayinka most brilliantly revealed her negative attitude toward Ukraine's "eternal enemy," condemned those Ukrainians who hope to aid Ukraine by

⁵¹Ibid., p. 17.

⁵²Ibid., p. 15.

⁵³L. Ukrayinka, Tvory, New York edition, Vol. I, pp. xi-xxxxi. (This foreword by P. Odarchenko was published in 1953 on the compilation of this edition.)

⁵⁴Ibid., p. xxxv.

⁵⁵Ibid., pp. xxiii-xxiv.

⁵⁶Ibid., p. xxxv.

serving Moscow, and "announced the necessity of a revolutionary armed struggle against the occupants as the only way to liberate Ukraine."⁵⁷ In 1962 and again in 1963, P. Odarchenko re-emphasized this theme.⁵⁸

N. Hlobenko views the drama from a different standpoint than do his Western contemporaries. Boyarynya, he characterizes, "presents a psychological tragedy in a Ukrainian family of the seventeenth century and is based on materials taken from Ukrainian folklore."⁵⁹ In his discussion of L. Ukrayinka's originality in her treatment of themes, Hlobenko points out that in Boyarynya the hero is the boyar's wife who "suffocates in the moral atmosphere of Moscow."⁶⁰

A short paragraph by K. Siehs⁶¹ seems to be but a condensation of L. Biletsky's work. V. Radzykevych comments only that Ukrainian-Muscovite relations lie in the base of Boyarynya, that the action takes place in the seventeenth century, that the alien Muscovite world and customs ruin Oksana's health, "break her spiritually and she dies of yearning for Ukraine. . . .", and that L. Ukrayinka portrayed well the

⁵⁷Ibid.

⁵⁸Petro Odarchenko, "Taras Shevchenko i Lesya Ukrayinka," Suchasnist' No. 4[16] (April, 1962), pp. 40-41; "Lesya Ukrayinka v radyans'kiy literaturniy krytytsi," No. 4[28] (April, 1963), p. 63.

⁵⁹N. (M.) Hlobenko, "Lesia Ukrainka," Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopaedia (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1963), Vol. I, p. 1041.

⁶⁰Mykola Ohloblyn-Hlobenko, Istoryko-literaturni staty. Zapysky naukovoho tovarystva imeny Shevchenka (New York-Paris-Munich, 1958), Vol. CLXVII, p. 48.

⁶¹Karl Siehs, "Lesya Ukrainka," The Ukrainian Review, Vol. X, No. 3, (1963), p. 83.

Muscovite and Ukrainian worlds.⁶²

His title "Vid uhodovstva do natsional'noyi zrazy" ("From Conciliation to National Betrayal") already implies R. Zadesnyansky's interpretation of the drama, for, in his opinion, the problem of conciliation and national betrayal lies in the core of Boyarynya.⁶³ In his attack on Dray-Khmara, Zadesnyansky admits that a three-fold analysis--historical, psychological and ideological--is possible and that it is erroneous to analyze only one plan of the drama, but he himself discusses only the ideological aspect on the justification that an acquaintance with all of L. Ukrayinka's creativity confirms that ideology is the most important aspect of her works.⁶⁴ Although he criticizes Dray-Khmara for not illuminating the artistic qualities of Boyarynya, he, himself, does not deal with them but rather with the verisimilitude of Taras Bulba.⁶⁵

The remainder of his study provides an act-by-act analysis of Boyarynya. The entire analysis, though, is unilateral and is a resound of his hatred of federalism and of its early exponents, M. Kostomarov and M. Drahomaniv. Zadesnyansky concludes that: (1) Boyarynya is

⁶²Volodymyr Radzykevych, Istoriya ukrayins'koyi literatury. Pidruchnyk dlya shkil i kursiv ukrajinoznavstva (New York: Shkil'na Rada, 1964), p. 127; and V. Radzykevych, Istoriya ukrayins'koyi literatury. Nova doba (Detroit: Bat'kivshchyna, 1956), Vol. III, p. 38.

⁶³R[oman Mlynovets'ky] Zadesnyans'ky, "Vid uhodovstva do natsional'noyi zrazy," Krytychni narysy. Tvorchist' Lesi Ukrayinky (n.p.: Ukrayins'ka krytychna dumka, n.d.), Vol. IV, pp. 78-98. (In the second edition which was printed in Munich, n.d., pp. 100-121.) Boyarynya is viewed in light of conciliation and betrayal also in Zadesnyans'ky, Lesya Ukrayinka (n.p.: Ukrayins'ka krytychna dumka, 1945), pp. 53-56.

⁶⁴Ibid., p. 85. (2nd ed., pp. 107-108).

⁶⁵Ibid., pp. 79, 85. (2nd ed., pp. 101, 107-108).

L. Ukrayinka's mouthpiece for declaring that any conciliation which progressively leads to national betrayal is treason; that in the Ukrainian case, federalism is this type of conciliation; and, that M. Kostomarov's idea of "one Slavic Union even under the tsar's sceptre" is especially such a conciliation; (2) Boyarynya is a denial of M. Drahomaniv's "justifications" that "petty objectives" for Ukraine "can be achieved with the support of 'favorably attuned' Muscovites" and a denial of his belief of the "uselessness of an armed struggle with the Muscovite nation"; and (3) that Boyarynya is a nationalistic drama because it treats "all Muscovites . . . as a hostile nation. . . . For Oksana, as for every Ukrainian nationalist, Muscovites are not 'brothers'; she sees no difference between them and the Tatars or other foreigners. . . ."66

It must be maintained, however, that it is the autocratic, tyrannic and oppressive government and social system that L. Ukrayinka denounces and not exponents of federalism, nor the Muscovite people. It is erroneous to say that L. Ukrayinka had a negative attitude toward the Muscovite people or toward foreigners. Zadesnyansky forgets that in the drama Oksana was the foreigner in Muscovy, that she also compares herself to a Tatar, and that Stepan's sister, Hanna, who has been brought up in the Muscovite society finds some of the Ukrainian customs very peculiar. Furthermore, L. Ukrayinka treated nationalities with deep regard, as is evident in her treatment of foreign literatures, in her study of languages, and in the foreign

⁶⁶Ibid., pp. 96-97. (2nd ed., p. 120).

adaptations in her creative works. The following memoir is an example of her teachings in this regard:

One must respect people. Do not look . . . on that or another pronunciation, or on the color of a cloak; because all nations live by their custom. Sympathize with the individual, [i.e.] with the good, honest person. Your right and duty is to treat with censure the people that wrong the poor man, wherever these oppressors are found.⁶⁷

The first part of this passage recalls the adage in the play: "whatever the country--such is the custom, and whatever the city--such is the habit."⁶⁸

Finally, Zadesnyansky must be censured for his method of analysis. First, for his emotionalism and tendentiousness, for his distortion of the content of the play, and misrepresentation of the main characters. He forces his own ideas into the content and compares Stepan to Judas, while Oksana is the saint and martyr who dies because she realizes that Stepan is a traitor and that she, in following him, betrayed her nation. Secondly, the author ignores the factors of dramatic expression, i.e. exposition, complication and resolution. He not only finds resolutions in the dramatist's complication but, also, in the exposition-- " . . . already in the beginning," declares Zadesnyansky, "the charges of national and high treason against

⁶⁷Kasiyan Hranat, "Zustrich z Leseju Ukrayinkoyu," Spohady . . ., p. 217.

⁶⁸L. Ukrayinka, Boyarynya, in Tvory, New York edition, Vol. VIII, p. 124. This probably stems from philosopher H. Skovoroda's poem "Pisn' X" which begins: "to all cities--[their own] customs and rules." See Antolohiya ukrayins'koyi poeziyi (Kiev: Derzhavne vydavnytsvo khudozhn'oyi literatury, 1958), Vol. I, p. 71.

69

Stepan's father are clearly formulated by the author." If the problem was resolved in the first act then the playwright would have had no need to continue the drama; thus, the author unconsciously underrates L. Ukrayinka's skill in dramaturgy. By such a statement, furthermore, Zadesnyansky confuses historical issues, for Stepan's father was a follower of Hetman Khmelnytsky. Zadesnyansky's method of analysis results, further, in the dismissal of important points in the culmination of the final act. He pays no heed to Stepan's words that provide a resolution to the problem of the drama, he does not place the warranted importance on Oksana's self-accusations, he overlooks the importance of the analogy of the rusty sword and sheath, interpolates a line (perhaps accidentally), and omits the final long passage spoken by Oksana since it cannot meet his interpretation.

A contrast to Zadesnyansky's report is the opinion by a contemporary Soviet critic, A. Deych:

To the end of her day she [L. Ukrayinka] did not free herself from errors and mistaken ideas that sometimes led her to the creation of works weak in the ideological sphere as, for example, the drama "Boyarynya" in which echoed the national-liberalism of Drahomaniv, tones basically foreign to her.⁷⁰

Dray-Khmara's opinion that Kostomarov's national ideals lie in Boyarynya prompted Zadesnyansky's counterclaim that the drama denounces

⁶⁹Zadesnyans'ky, "Vid uhodovstva . . . ," p. 88. (2nd ed., p. 111).

⁷⁰A. Deych, Lesya Ukrainka (Moscow, 1953), p. 129, cited by M. Hlobenko, "Na shlyakhakh fal'syfikatsiyi," Z literaturoznavchoyi spadshchyny (Paris: Natsionalistychne vydavnytstvo v Evropi, 1961), p. 194. Cf. Odarchenko, "Lesya Ukrayinka v radyans'kiy literaturniy krytytsi," p. 59. (There is no mention of Boyarynya in A. Deych's "Dramaturgiya," Lesya Ukrainka (Moscow, 1954), pp. 83-132.)

Kostomarov's and Drahomaniv's ideas about federalism, while for Deych Drahomaniv's national liberalism resounds through the drama. In his article on L. Ukrayinka's play Orgiya (The Orgy), Deych calls Boyarynya an "ideological erratum."⁷¹

The contemporary Soviet scholars Oleh Babyshkin and Varvara Kurashova briefly observe the historical aspect of the drama.⁷² They admit that L. Ukrayinka, in her reaction against the colonial tsarist policies, accurately depicts the voyevoda oppression and that she correctly portrays the patriarchal ways of the boyars, the Domostroy tenor of life, and Ukraine's passion for freedom. Nevertheless they evaluate the entire work as unsuccessful because, in their viewpoint, the Russo-Ukrainian post-Pereyaslav relations are shown partially and thus inaccurately, and because L. Ukrayinka, in considering the reactionary and evil in the boyars' deeds, failed to see ("except in a few cases") what united the two "brother" nations.⁷³

The authors also criticize the characterization of the central figures of the drama. Oksana is "painted in one color," emphasizing only her nostalgia for the homeland; her portrait becomes somewhat irresolute and self-renunciating because her yearning is only passive;

⁷¹Deych, "Ostannya drama Lesi Ukrayinky," in Lesya Ukrayinka, Publikatsiyi, statyi, doslidzhennya (Kiev: Akademiya nauk, Ukr. RSR, 1956), Vol. II, p. 370.

⁷²Oleh Babyshkin and Varvara Kurashova, Lesya Ukrayinka (Kiev: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oyi literatury, 1955), pp. 436-438.

⁷³Ibid., p. 436. (The authors do not elaborate upon the statements.)

while Stepan is not only irresolute, his portrayal is incorrect because L. Ukrayinka "did not adequately know the actual state of affairs in Ukraine and in Russia" in the 1660's.⁷⁴ According to Babyshkin and Kurashova, Stepan's character should be that of a Ukrainian officer who betrayed the interests of the toiling masses and who, for personal interests and on the pretext of serving Ukraine, served the tsar, thus aiding tsarism to enslave other nations "including the Russian people."⁷⁵

Babyshkin and Kurashova declare that L. Ukrayinka, "in every possible way, manoeuvred" the publishing of Boyarynya because she felt that the drama was "unsuccessful," "conceptually incorrect," and that the characters are "unilateral."⁷⁶ In an attempt to substantiate this argument, the authors draw from the two letters wherein L. Ukrayinka discussed Boyarynya and utilize excerpts from these letters in such a way as to distort the original meaning. There is nothing in this correspondence to indicate that L. Ukrayinka had such feelings about her drama. One letter concerns the subjectivism in the personage of Oksana and the other is a request for primary sources which the dramatist could use for future reference.⁷⁷ It is interesting that in two of his recent studies⁷⁸ Babyshkin uses the letter concerning subjectivism to substantiate his discussion on the

⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁵ Ibid.

⁷⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁷ Cf. letters to A. Kryms'ky, Oct. 14, 1911 and May 24, 1912.

⁷⁸ In "Mystets'ky svit Lesi Ukrayinky," in Lesya Ukrayinka, Pro mystetstvo, pp. 7-34 and "Z psykhologhiyi tvorchosti Lesi Ukrayinky," Ukrayins'ka mova . . ., pp. 7-11.

autobiographism and subjectivism in L. Ukrayinka's works. These studies invalidate Babyshkin's above argument regarding that letter.

According to the above authors, L. Ukrayinka, in the letter of May 24, 1912, was also supposed to have written that her works on historical themes interest her not in the sphere of political history, but cultural history.⁷⁹ This statement is not in this letter, however. L. Ukrayinka names other themes on which she planned to write from the standpoint of cultural rather than political history.⁸⁰

On the basis of these distortions, Babyshkin and Kurashova provide their deceiving evaluation: "The basic reason for the failure of 'Boyarynya' was the absence of reliable historical sources which were hidden or falsified by bourgeois-nationalistic historians."⁸¹ The co-authors conclude that Boyarynya cannot be identified with those works of L. Ukrayinka which concern the question of the national struggle for liberation, and that a witness to this is her lyrical cycle "Vesna v Yehypti" ("Spring in Egypt") and her poem "I ty kolys' borolas' mov Izrayil' . . . " ("And Thou Once Fought Like Israel . . . ").⁸² The authors do not explain how these works are a witness to their invalid statement. They assert that in the latter poem the poetess underscores the "progressive meaning of the Treaty

⁷⁹Babyshkin and Kurashova, Lesya Ukrayinka, p. 437.

⁸⁰Letter to A. Kryms'ky, May 24, 1912, p. 334.

⁸¹Babyshkin and Kurashova, Lesya Ukrayinka, p. 437.

⁸²Ibid., pp. 437-438.

of Pereyaslav,"⁸³ but L. Ukrayinka's sympathies never lay with Bohdan Khmelnytsky's policy at Pereyaslav. The above-mentioned poem, as Boyarynya, clearly expresses her denunciation of that alliance which resulted in what the poetess terms "darkness," "terror," "disunity" and "Egyptian captivity" in Ukraine.⁸⁴

In the 1963-1965 Kievan ten-volume edition of L. Ukrayinka's works Boyarynya is the only drama that is omitted, but in his foreword to this compilation,⁸⁵ O. Babyshkin devotes about a page to Boyarynya. L. Ukrayinka's objective was not to portray historical events "of which," explains Babyshkin, "she could not gain a thorough and objective understanding because of the lack of methodological works in history"; rather it is to show how a voluntary denial of an active struggle can cause spiritual and physical decadence.⁸⁶ Also, as before, Babyshkin falsely remarks that L. Ukrayinka wrote that historical themes interested her from the cultural, rather than the politico-historical, standpoint because she felt that in Boyarynya the political history was unilaterally depicted.⁸⁷

Babyshkin observes that sacrificing oneself for others and for one's nation was one of the highest principles of L. Ukrayinka's ethics and that this principle guides the heroes in her poetic dramas,

⁸³Ibid., p. 438.

⁸⁴L. Ukrayinka, "I ty kolys' borolas' mov Izrayil' . . .," Tvory, Kiev edition, Vol. I, p. 334. Translated by Vera Rich in Lesya Ukrayinka, Selected Works (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1960), pp. 257-258.

⁸⁵Babyshkin, "Lesya Ukrayinka," in L. Ukrayinka, Tvory, Kiev edition, Vol. I, pp. 5-40.

⁸⁶Ibid., p. 30.

⁸⁷Ibid., p. 31.

including Oksana in Boyarynya.⁸⁸ In describing the psychological aspect of the drama Babyshkin writes that one of the reasons for the personal and national tragedy in Boyarynya is the lack of active participation of the main characters in the important events of their time:

Oksana, in losing her freedom, which she could not properly evaluate in Ukraine, became convinced that love is all-embracing only then, when it is not suppressed by the yoke. Oksana weakens spiritually and physically. . . . Nostalgia and the obvious symptoms of tuberculosis result not only from tedium but, most important, from Oksana's loss of freedom, and then comes also the realization of her uselessness in life. . . . Stepan lacked the strength to fight, so that his flower does not wither. Both of them did not become fighters: Stepan because he was not "born a fighter," and Oksana because she succumbed to pity and did not fight for her beloved. Oksana sees that Stepan is incapable of changing his situation. There is only one thing left for him to do--this is to offer passive aid to those who will rise again in a new struggle against tsardom. Merit in this is not great, and Oksana does not console herself with any illusions. In Oksana lives the faith that her nation did not succumb under oppression, that sooner or later it will procure freedom for itself. . . .⁸⁹

Babyshkin concludes that Oksana's final words (her apostrophe of the sun) are the playwright's dedication to her descendants "to whom it was destined, in united action with the Russian and other brotherly nations, to overthrow tsardom and to construct a free and prosperous life in Russia and Ukraine."⁹⁰

⁸⁸Ibid., p. 21. Babyshkin says that this principle resounds through all of her works that were written after the loss of her loved one in 1901. The fact is, however, that this principle resounds through her works even before 1901, particularly in 1895 and 1896 and even in 1889 in the poem "Na rokovyny Shevchenka," ("On Shevchenko's Birthday"), in L. Ukrayinka, Tvory, Kiev edition, Vol. I, pp. 65-66.

⁸⁹Babyshkin, "Lesya Ukrayinka," in L. Ukrayinka, Tvory, Kiev edition, Vol. I, pp. 30-31.

⁹⁰Ibid.

Babyshkin evaluates Boyarynya only by comparing it with L. Ukrayinka's poetic drama Advokat Martiyan (The Advocate Martianus). He believes that the latter work is better artistically and that the characters therein are greater portraits than those in Boyarynya because they are endowed with the ability to function in the situation in which they found themselves.⁹¹ Similarly in an earlier essay, Babyshkin mentioned that L. Ukrayinka regretted that Oksana did not become a fighter as did other heroines in her dramatic works.⁹² Babyshkin does not explain where he acquired the information that she disliked her portrayal of Oksana, nor for what reason a writer should have all his heroes functioning in the same way. The playwright gives just as great a lesson with the inaction of Oksana as with the action of Martianus or any other hero.

The most recent mention of Boyarynya is made by Constantine Bida.⁹³ He correctly asserts that in this work L. Ukrayinka "expressed her deep patriotism and her grief at the unfortunate lot of her fatherland. . . . her views on problems of her people's political independence, and cultural and national identity."⁹⁴ But Bida's summation seems to be based upon Dray-Khmara's work, for it reiterates much of what has been

⁹¹Ibid.

⁹²Oleh Babyshkin, "Slovo pro Lesyu (Do 50-richchya z dnya smerti)," Ukrayins'ka mova i literatura v shkoli, No. 6 (August, 1963), p. 11.

⁹³In Constantine Bida, "Life and Work," in Lesya Ukrainka, Selected Works, trans. Vera Rich (Toronto: The University of Toronto Press, 1968), pp. 71-73.

⁹⁴Ibid., p. 72.

said there. Even the gist of Dray-Khmara's allegorical interpretation is quoted, i.e. that Stepan represents a nineteenth-twentieth century intellectual who renounced his culture and Oksana represents one who had struggled for national self-determination, but who dies on foreign soil because she is caught in the mills of the Muscovite service.⁹⁵ Bida states that although Boyarynya is a psychological drama it reflects the playwright's "thorough knowledge of the historical, cultural and social environment of seventeenth-century Ukraine" and also that it reveals L. Ukrayinka's "deep knowledge of the Bible."⁹⁶ The first statement should be extended to incorporate the playwright's thorough knowledge of seventeenth-century Muscovy and, in regard to the second statement, there is no doubt that L. Ukrayinka did have a deep knowledge of the Bible,⁹⁷ but, surely, the parable of Cain and Abel in Boyarynya provides no proof of this.

Bida's brief description of the plot ignores Stepan and thus is really an incomplete characterization of Oksana:

Her subordinate position, the foreign environment, and strange and difficult customs awaken longings for her native Ukraine. The hostile attitude of the Muscovite world towards the Ukrainian . . . movement . . . deepens Oksana's feelings of estrangement and grief. As a result of her troubles Oksana falls . . . ill. Stepan suggests they . . . return to

⁹⁵Ibid. As Dray-Khmara, Bida writes that the drama may have been prompted by critics and nostalgia. He mentions the same historical sources, as did Dray-Khmara, and the nostalgia motif in her other works.

⁹⁶Bida, "Life and Works," p. 73.

⁹⁷See Petro Odarchenko, "Pereklady Lesi Ukrayinky z Bibliyi," Nasha kul'tura, No. 1 and No. 2 (1951), pp. 22-25 and pp. 22-27 respectively.

Ukraine. . . . In her opinion, Stepan had no right to return . . . because . . . he remained passive in the service of the tsar.⁹⁸

There exist two types of classifications of L. Ukrayinka's poetic dramas. Zerov, accordant with A. V. Nikovsky, divides them in respect to length.⁹⁹ One group, it is classified, includes the "great [long] dramas" which received much time and attention in their production, as U pushchi (In the Wilderness), Kassandra (Cassandra), Lisova pisnya (The Forest Song), Kaminny hospodar (The Stone Host) and Rufin i Pristsilla (Rufinus and Priscilla), while the second group consists of short one-act dialogues which were a kind of preparatory study for the great dramas and trials of materials, like Na ruyinakh (Upon the Ruins), U katakombakh (In the Catacombs), and Aysha ta Mokhammed (Aishah and Mohammed). (But only the latter work is a dialogue.) To this division Zerov adds dramas that are "not great [long]," as Boyarynya and Advokat Martiyan. Since the plan for Boyarynya was formulated in 1895 and since the play had been read and discussed by L. Ukrayinka's family, the work must have received more time and thought than Zerov acknowledges. Furthermore, the length of a play is a poor criterion, not only of drama, but of the time and attention that was allotted to the play in its composition.

⁹⁸Bida, "Life and Work," p. 72.

⁹⁹Mykola Zerov, "Rufin i Pristsilla (Do istoriyi zadumu i vykonannya)," L. Ukrayinka, Tvory, New York edition, Vol. VII, p. 21. Zerov is referring to Nikovs'ky's article in Rada, No. 26 (1912).

M. Bozhenko, on the other hand, classifies Boyarynya as a great poetic drama along with U pushchi, Kassandra, Advokat Martiyan, and Orgiya. He explains that these great dramas differ from those of the small form in that they contain broader problematics, a greater number of characters, different principles of construction, a deep psychological drama of one person, and a preponderance of monologue.¹⁰⁰ But none of these factors are discussed in light of each of the mentioned dramas. Boyarynya, moreover, contains no monologue and this form of dialogue is only very slight in the other dramas.

The summary of the known comments, interpretations, and evaluations concerning Boyarynya indicates that heretofore this poetic drama has not only received little attention but attention of a biased nature. Western scholars (except Hlobenko) have concentrated on the ideological aspect of Boyarynya in which lies the basic theme of the drama, whereas Soviet scholars have, for the most part, avoided this theme. Only two Soviet critics, O. Biletsky and A. Deych, have noted this aspect but they have written only a few and evasive lines in this respect. The early writers in Ukraine, Muzychka, Vasylenko, Yakubsky, Zerov, and Dray-Khmara escaped direct observation of the drama by irrelevant comment. Babyshkin's and Kurashova's deceiving criticisms of the dramatist and the drama are invalid, but Babyshkin's most recent observation of the plot is an improvement; yet, as it has already been noted, the most recent Kievan edition of L. Ukrayinka's

¹⁰⁰ M. K. Bozhenko, "Dramatychni poemy Lesi Ukrayinky," Ukrayins'ka mova i literatura v shkoli, No. 9 (September, 1966), p. 14.

works, which are edited by Babyshkin, excludes Boyarynya. The play is omitted entirely in a bibliographical source on L. Ukrayinka¹⁰¹ and a review by N. Padalka in 1966 indicates that this drama has never been studied in Soviet schools.¹⁰² It is interesting, too, that Bozhenko describes the context of each of the great dramas of his classification, with the sole exception of Boyarynya.¹⁰³ In 1963 Odarchenko, in his research on Soviet literary criticism of L. Ukrayinka, explains that since Boyarynya is one of the works which is "impossible to lay in the Procrustean bed of the contemporary Soviet scheme," it is either ignored or unintelligibly described and its ideological content and clear symbolism are avoided.¹⁰⁴

Nevertheless, the Western writers must also be censured, for in their narrow focus on ideology they have either misconstrued, or ignored, or neglected the line of action which concerns the boyar's wife, avoided the momentous social-psychological aspect of both lines of action, and failed to consider the broad thematics which the drama comprises. The ideology in Boyarynya does constitute the basic theme, but the drama itself is constructed upon this ideological base with

¹⁰¹M. V. Bulavyts'ka, Lesya Ukrayinka: bibliohrafichny pokazhchyk (Kiev: Akademiya nauk Ukr. RSR, 1956). This bibliography indicates that Boyarynya is not published or discussed in dramatic criticism in Ukraine.

¹⁰²N. I. Padalka, "Dramaturhiya Lesi Ukrayinky ta yiyi vyvchennya v shkoli," Lesya Ukrayinka v shkoli. Posibnyk dlya vchyteliv (Kiev: Radyans'ka shkola, 1966), pp. 152-153.

¹⁰³Bozhenko, "Dramatychni poemy . . . ," p. 14.

¹⁰⁴Odarchenko, "Lesya Ukrayinka v radyans'kiy literaturniy krytytsi," p. 63.

the social-psychological framework of the plot reigning supreme.

In general, emphasis is unreasonably laid on Oksana's yearning and on Stepan's being Russified, on Oksana's virtues and Stepan's vices. Stepan, unlike the playwright's portrayal, has been described as the villain, rather than the hero. It has been overlooked that both Stepan and Oksana share the same ideology at the outset of the play and that both heroes reverse their ideology as the plot develops. Most important, the keys to the understanding of the drama have been entirely overlooked. The analogy that explains the psychological tragedy has been unmentioned as well as the expressions of guilt wherein each hero concedes his faults and explains the reasons for them. The mental anguish of both heroes invokes compassion for both Oksana and Stepan. Had the critics concentrated some attention on the factors of dramatic expression, i.e. exposition, complication, and resolution and the elements of dramatic composition--theme expression, character creation, and plot construction--they might not have reiterated each other's errors in their interpretations of the drama.

In regard to artistic evaluations of the poetic drama, it can be said that they are non-existent. No literary critic has provided a study of the poetical or dramaturgical structure of Boyarynya. The most recent Kievan publication about L. Ukrayinka's poetics does not touch upon this drama.¹⁰⁵ Comparative statements and the classifications by Nikovsky, Zerov and Bozhenko do not promote the understanding of this drama as a work of art.

¹⁰⁵Lelya P. Kulins'ka, Poetyka Lesi Ukrayinky (Kiev: Kyyivs'ky universytet, [1967]).

CHAPTER IV

THE DRAMATIC COMPOSITION OF BOYARYNYA

A. THE THEME

The theme may be the starting point of drama. It serves as a unifying agent: it "binds the play together" and "gives it that most important thing in all art--unity of impression."¹ In a successful play the theme is such that it lends itself to a satisfactory conclusion.² Great dramas, moreover, contain significant themes, of universal and lasting interest:³ they appeal to both the intellect and the emotions and entertain as well as instruct.⁴

The thematic approach is subjective: the playwright, as a result of his heritage and of the influence of his society, expresses his own point of view in his drama; it is this point of view, the theme, that gives his work of art purpose or meaning.⁵ A good playwright, however, does not force his opinion upon the reader or audience through explicit statements, but conveys it, implicitly,

¹Roger M. Busfield, Jr., The Playwright's Art: Stage, Radio, Television, Motion Pictures (New York: Harper & Bros. Publishers, 1958), p. 77. (The quote is cited by Busfield from Charles Klein, New York Press, March 1, 1914.) Cf. Yakiv Mamontov, Teatral'na publitsystyka (Kiev: Mystetstvo, 1967), pp. 199-200.

²William Archer, Play-making: A Manual of Craftsmanship (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1960), p. 40.

³Milton Marx, The Enjoyment of Drama (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1961), p. 152.

⁴Busfield, The Playwright's Art, p. 75.

⁵Ibid., p. 78. Cf. Mamontov, Teatral'na publitsystyka, p. 199.

through the medium of action and dialogue.⁶

In Boyarynya, L. Ukrayinka propounds the theme that an oppressed nation can attain national objectives only through a unified, armed struggle against the despotic, imperialistic government which oppresses it and that conciliation with such a government cannot benefit the oppressed nation. The long history of Russia's exploitation and oppression of Ukraine, and the lack of national and individual freedom that the author witnessed in the Tsarist regime, prompted her to write numerous works based on this underlying concept. This theme, however, is significant not only to the Ukraine of the seventeenth century, to the Ukraine of L. Ukrayinka's time, or to the Ukraine of today: it poses an eternal problem of mankind and, therefore, is of universal and lasting interest.

Although the theme in Boyarynya is the playwright's appeal to the oppressed to rise against tyranny, her appeal is not forced upon the reader or spectator, nor does it smother the play. It is dramatically effected and is thus made to appear secondary. Thematic implicitness is achieved in a number of skilful ways. First, it lies in L. Ukrayinka's method of theme presentation. The theme is projected from a verbal duel between Stepan and Ivan, who present equally convincing arguments for war and for peace. The drama is set in motion to prove Stepan's rebuttal: "And really does the musket and sword possess more strength and honor than the pen and a sincere word?"⁷ Having

⁶Busfield, The Playwright's Art, pp. 82-84.

⁷L. Ukrayinka, Boyarynya, in Tvory (New York: Tyshchenko and Bilous, 1954), Vol. VIII, p. 116.

postulated that strength and honor ought to be sought in peace, the playwright embarks on helping the heroes to attain these qualities and permits them to discover the answer to the theme question in the consequences of their action. Second, thematic implicitness is achieved by careful development of characters. During the verbal duel between Stepan and Ivan, it is difficult for the reader or spectator to favor any side, not only because both exponents debate convincingly, but also because the viewpoints of both are brought within the scope of the reader's or spectator's understanding and acceptance. Perebiyny's attitude--his lack of condemnation, his respect and understanding for both sides--evokes the same attitude in the reader or audience. Besides, the dramatist's favoritism for Stepan necessitates a polarization around him, sympathy is aroused for him and his beliefs, which are contrary to the beliefs of the playwright. Third, the theme is subdued by a very strong subplot. The boyar's wife becomes more interesting to the reader, audience and even the playwright, than does the boyar, whom the theme mainly concerns. Fourth, implicitness of theme is further attained by laying emphasis on the psychology of the characters; in this way the author achieves a social-psychological drama and not a propaganda play.

L. Ukrayinka's purpose in Boyarynya is to instruct, yet there is no doubt that the drama appeals to the heart as well as the mind, that it entertains as well as instructs. The ever-significant theme, which affords an interesting starting point, which lends unity and coherence to the whole and which concludes in a satisfactory ending, is one of the elements that makes Boyarynya an excellent drama.

B. CHARACTER CREATION

The theme of a drama is developed by characters.⁸ A play may contain essential and auxiliary characters. While the essential ones are indispensable to the theme, auxiliary personages are not indispensable to it, but are "convenient for filling in the canvas and carrying on the action."⁹

In character creation the playwright's main concern is to make his central figures interesting and likable so that the reader or spectator cares what happens to them and wants them to achieve their desired goal.¹⁰ In a tragedy, the tragic hero, who endeavors to attain an unattainable goal¹¹ should neither be too good, nor too bad.¹² He should be "better than ourselves, but not perfect" and "should suffer from a flaw which shows itself in some mistaken judgment or act resulting in his downfall."¹³

In the development of character, his reaction to a series of crucial experiences is important; dramatic crises should unveil latent qualities in the personage and produce "not . . . a change, but . . .

⁸Archer, Play-making, p. 48.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰Busfield, The Playwright's Art, pp. 95-98.

¹¹Ibid., pp. 92-93.

¹²Aristotle, "The Poetics," Masterplots, Frank N. Magill (ed.), (New York: Salem Press, 1964), Vol. XI, p. 2924.

¹³Ibid., p. 2925.

an exhaustive manifestation of character."¹⁴ Once developed, the personage "must live out [his] destiny. What [he] does is the logical outcome of [his] character."¹⁵ Moreover, the personage should be so developed that at the end of the drama the reader or spectator knows "more of the protagonist's character than he himself, or his most intimate friend could know at the beginning; for the action should have been such as to put it to some novel and searching test."¹⁶

i) Essential Characters

Stepan and Oksana are the essential characters and tragic heroes in Boyarynya. Stepan begins the development of the theme while Oksana takes the supporting role after the drama has been set in motion. Hereupon both, logically, carry the theme forward to its successful conclusion.

In the embryonic stage of theme development, Stepan plays the role of an expositor of vital data about his family background and the social, political and historical background of his homeland. He reveals his views, the views of a devout and persistent proponent of peace, who desires that his nation conciliates with its enemy. Utilizing Christian ideals, Stepan very ably defends his views against the

¹⁴ Archer, Play-making, p. 246. Cf. George Pierce Baker, Dramatic Technique (London: Jonathan Cape, [1919]), pp. 237-239, and Mamontov, Teatral'na publitsystyka, p. 205.

¹⁵ Rachel Crothers quoted in Busfield, The Playwright's Art, p. 91. Cf. Baker, Dramatic Technique, pp. 251-254 in regard to character consistency.

¹⁶ Archer, Play-making, p. 246.

attack of his dynamic antagonist. The hero postulates the theme that honor is found in peace and that ultimate strength is designed for the peacemakers.

The playwright polarizes the readers or spectators around Stepan immediately. With the aid of the gracious Perebiyny household, it is revealed that Stepan is a likable person, polite, kind, and gentle. The endearment of the hero to Oksana's parents and to Oksana endears him also to the readers or spectators. Sympathy for Stepan is already aroused at the very outset, and particularly in the love scene, when he relates the agony in his work; it is his courage and sincere belief in his idealistic cause that win admiration and support for him. The skilful incorporation of Christian teachings (the Biblical passage about Cain and Abel, in particular) and Stepan's reverential attitude towards these teachings illuminate the positive qualities in the hero.

In striving to attain his goal, the tragic hero soon realizes that the goal is out of reach. He recognizes his "mistaken judgment" that a divided, subjugated people can gain concessions from a powerful, imperialistic despot; but he is unable to turn the tide of events and his subsequent personal tragedy resolves the theme of the play.

Each dramatic crisis discloses a flaw in Stepan's character--he consistently succumbs to fear. Fear, in turn, leads him to actions that not only shock his wife, but agonize him also; it leads him to hypocrisy, shallow-souled materialism, buffoonery, irrationality in expectations of Oksana, doubt and indecisiveness, and finally to mental anguish. Yet, L. Ukrayinka cautiously maintains a balance between the

hero's positive and negative traits. When the reader or spectator is becoming disappointed in Stepan (in Act III, during and after his discourse with the Cossack) the playwright re-arouses sympathy for him (in the melancholy scene in Act IV when he expresses his helplessness). Therefore, even though the reader or audience may find Stepan blameworthy, L. Ukrayinka allows her tragic hero to remain in reach of human sympathy.

Having created a character who is possessed by fear and who "was not born a fighter," as Oksana and Stepan eventually discover, the playwright allows him to live out his destiny, logically, according to his character, in his bewildering "conciliatory" position. Yet, she does so optimistically, for there is hope that Stepan will eventually recover a favorable social and self-image.

Oksana lends her support to the development of the theme in the closing of the first act, when she accepts Stepan's hand and with it his ideology and aspiration to his goal. She discovers early that the desired goal is fiction, but still, much to her adversity, continues to act on her husband's behalf. She discovers too late, however, that she was mistaken in allowing her husband to continue his actions; herein lies her heartrending tragedy and the underscoring of the theme's resolution.

Polarization around the heroine is achieved by the romantic approach. By endearing Oksana to Stepan and to his family, the author endears her to the reader or audience. But more important, in creating Oksana, L. Ukrayinka bestows on her many positive qualities--intelligence, diligence, politeness, kindness, sentimentality, modesty,

sincerity, generosity, sensitivity, honesty, faithfulness, love, compassion, virtuousness, beauty, pride and dignity. It is by her very nature that Oksana captures everyone. The playwright places Oksana in the limelight through most of the play to acquaint her intimately with the reader or spectator so that eventually one feels with her intensely. Character "is indispensable to enduring interest in drama"¹⁷ and Oksana is the character who steals Boyarynya.

In each dramatic crisis Oksana reveals what she believes is the right action and, yet, each time, she cannot act according to her belief because she, as she herself admits, yields to pity for the man that she loves. Oksana cannot escape the wrongdoings, she has failed to alter them, and she can no longer bear to watch them. Thus, for each successive crisis, Oksana progressively weakens physically and psychologically and, like the tragic hero, is left to "live out her destiny." It is clear that the tragic heroine will die after the completion of the drama, but she will die because she cannot live and not because L. Ukrayinka needs to utilize death as a tool for a "curtain." The playwright has placed the heroine "at such odds with life that reconciliation, or mere endurance, would be morally base or psychologically improbable."¹⁸

¹⁷ Ibid., pp. 111-112. Cf. Mamontov, Teatral'na publitsystyka, p. 55.

¹⁸ Archer, Play-making, p. 232; see pp. 232-234 in regard to the ending of a tragedy.

ii) Auxiliary Characters

Seven auxiliary characters participate in Boyarynya. In order of importance to theme development they are: Ivan, Oleksa Perebiyny, the Cossack guest, Stepan's mother and Hanna, Mrs. Perebiyny and the orderly. Besides these, there are a few servants who do not participate in the dialogue and some "off-stage" characters who live in the drama.

Ivan plays the part of the antagonist in Act I and, with Stepan, is of utmost importance in the initial development of the theme: he is the instrument by which the playwright brings the main issue to the fore. Ivan is the playwright's aid in revealing Stepan's character, his viewpoint and beliefs, and in eliciting exposition from Stepan and Perebiyny. His "cut-and-thrust" dialogue is vital in provoking thought and interest in the mind of the reader or audience.

Although L. Ukrayinka has given Ivan a very brief role and although she has made him a rude person, she has projected his character with enormous energy. Certainly, this enables him to perform his incidental function eloquently, and arrests the reader's or spectator's attention, but it seems that he becomes too important, too interesting and too vivid to be neglected after performing his service in the play. "The incidental character must be real enough to be believable . . . yet he must remain sufficiently in the background so as not to arouse our interest. . . ." ¹⁹ On the other hand, the reader

¹⁹ Busfield, The Playwright's Art, p. 101. Cf. Archer, Playmaking, pp. 67, 80.

or spectator is at least gratified to learn, much later in the play, that the courageous and bold Ivan has secretly delivered a banner to the hetman.

The Cossack officer Perebiyny is one of the playwright's chief expositors of the past. By his rank, age, background and serenity, he personifies wisdom in national affairs and in this wisdom lies the playwright's power of persuasion to regard, for a moment, that the historical past was a historical necessity and that Stepan is right in his actions. Perebiyny, in his role as a mediator in the controversy between Stepan and Ivan, performs an important twofold and paradoxical function in the unfolding of the theme--he interjects statements into the conflict to suspend the crisis but at the same time he is the dramatist's aid in sustaining it. His interjections do not stop the conflict, they only help prevent it from culminating: thereby the interest is maintained after it has heightened and the playwright carries the action forward to give the theme a chance to develop. Although Perebiyny does not hold the same opinion as Stepan, he seemingly takes Stepan's side in the controversy. This is in due respect to his guest, of course, and thus a natural effect is attained by the playwright. Perebiyny's understanding and regard for Stepan's viewpoint also add to the amiability of Stepan's character and aid in the polarization around him, for the wise Cossack too is rooting for Stepan: "Somehow we are not accustomed to hearing such. . . But then . . . perhaps there would be less sin and evil in this world if all thought

as you. . . ."20

The Cossack guest appears in Act III. The two services which he performs set the stage for the turning point of the drama; he delivers a petition to Stepan and informs him of the recent developments in Ukraine. While the Cossack functions as an expositor he elicits an expository response from Stepan about the political situation in Muscovy. This elicitation in turn unveils negative traits in Stepan's character.

Since the play is transferred to a new setting in the second act, the dramatist must introduce the reader or audience to the setting. This introduction is made by Stepan's mother and sister, Hanna. Through them the author affords a sociological exploration as well as a psychological inquiry into the heroine's adjustment to the new conditions and atmosphere. At the same time, their roles reveal Oksana's character. Both personages are also of vital importance in heightening the tension at the end of the second and fourth acts. In the opening of the final act, Mother, by her concern for Oksana, sustains the tension from the preceding act and is effectual in producing a natural continuation or outcome of the preceding events.

Mother's and Hanna's exits are wisely arranged. Mother leaves the stage before Stepan's and Oksana's finalé to prepare a medicinal beverage for Oksana. Hanna's exit into marriage, which takes place behind the scenes, is in careful preparation from the moment that Hanna's name enters the drama. This preparation is manifest in the

²⁰L. Ukrayinka, Boyarynya, p. 116.

discussion about her fiancé and betrothal, in Oksana's sewing for the trousseau, and in the materials bought for Hanna. These preparative items, in turn, give the playwright the reason for comparing customs, for Oksana's sewing and for the parcels that, in part, trigger the crisis in the penultimate act. The engagement is thus ingeniously interwoven into the drama. Although it remains of no consequence to the theme it adds a bright, essential, and functional thread to the overall design of the plot.

Added to the bright side of the plot are the positive portrayals of Mother and Hanna. Unlike the traditional in-laws they are good and kind to Oksana. Mother is, above all, a comforting and consoling factor and, as befits the plot, is an embodiment of folklore. Hanna's frivolous nature is well-suited for her role in the drama. Both these personages lend a tender touch to the play and thus maintain an emotional balance in it; negative characters would be too much to bear for Oksana, the reader and audience. Both personages also relieve the play of any discriminatory or prejudicial elements; without their help, Oksana might have produced such elements. Thus Mother and Hanna perform the same functions in the drama. The division of the role, however, serves to keep the functions implicit and to achieve not only a natural but a more interesting and vivid effect.

Whereas the other auxiliary characters played important roles in carrying on the action, Mrs. Perebiyny only "fills in the canvas." Yet, without her the Perebiyny household would not have been complete and the playwright would not have attained a natural effect. Mrs. Perebiyny's efficiency, her politeness and graciousness, are instrumental in

acquainting the reader or audience with Oksana's background. The playwright utilizes Mrs. Perebiyny's motherly concern about her son's bad manners in the same way that she used Mr. Perebiyny's interjections--in pretense of wanting to suspend the conflict between Stepan and Ivan. She thus creates a natural effect. Mrs. Perebiyny, moreover, elicits an expository response from Stepan and, by her favoritism for him, aids in polarizing the reader or audience around him. Finally, at the end of the first act, Mrs. Perebiyny's voice indicates the coming of the curtain and then, with one line, closes it.

Mr. Perebiyny's servant--a Cossack officer's orderly--enters the first act with Stepan's baggage uttering but one line that he has brought it. He is an indication of Perebiyny's status, and thus of Oksana's background. His utterance plays the most important part in dispersing the people from the supper table and from the controversy, thereby helping the playwright to leave the conclusion of that controversy to be effected through subsequent action. The other servants in the drama also indicate the status of the central figures.

Stepan's little brother, although twice mentioned, does not make a stage appearance. Since he lives in Stepan's home, where most of the action takes place, it is unnatural that he exist only backstage. On the other hand, there are persons mentioned who do not appear on-stage, but their presence is not demanded by the requirements of drama and their role is well enough played behind the scenes. These are the boyars, the tsar's rifleman and Yakhnenko. Each of these adds coloration to the drama while Yakhnenko also provides a historical fact; he was Doroshenko's father-in-law, who in 1676 arrived in Muscovy

as a messenger for the hetman.²¹ The tsar and Hetman Doroshenko are essential to the development of the theme, yet their names are sufficient to dominate the stage. Although the tsar is the villain in the drama it was not important that the playwright present him on stage.

Every auxiliary character of Boyarynya enters into the drama and exits in a natural manner. Each is real enough to be believable and each, except perhaps Ivan, remains far enough in the background so as not to arouse our interest in him particularly. As is befitting for a psychological tragedy, the essential characters have the stage to themselves most of the time.²²

C. PLOT CONSTRUCTION

The plot is "the arrangement of the events which make up the play."²³ Its essential elements are a protagonist, a goal, and an obstacle to the goal,²⁴ while its function is to logically illustrate the theme.²⁵ The play must have a beginning, middle and end.²⁶ "The beginning," defines Aristotle, is "that which does not necessarily

²¹Mykhaylo Dray-Khmara, "Boyarynya," Tvory (New York: Tyshchenko and Bilous, 1954), Vol. VIII, p. 101. Dray-Khmara is citing M. Kostomarov, Ruina (M[oscow], 1882), p. 499.

²²See Archer, Play-making, p. 49.

²³Aristotle, "The Poetics," p. 2924. Cf. Busfield, The Playwright's Art, p. 104.

²⁴Busfield, The Playwright's Art, p. 107.

²⁵M. Marx, The Enjoyment of Drama, p. 32.

²⁶Aristotle, "The Poetics," p. 2924 and Archer, Play-making, p. 55.

follow anything else but does necessarily give rise to further action"; "the middle" is what "follows the beginning and gives rise to the end"; and, "the end" is that which "necessarily follows from what has gone before but does not necessarily lead to further events."²⁷

i) The Beginning

(a) Method of Attack. According to William Archer there are three ways of opening a play. If the play is designed for light entertainment, the author will probably first show his personages in their normal state, he will indicate their characters, circumstances and relations and then allow the crisis to develop on stage. In a more stirring type of drama, the playwright may plunge right into the crisis to capture the attention of the audience immediately, while in the third type, the curtain is drawn on "profound peace, which is presently found to be but a thin crust over an absolutely volcanic condition of affairs, the origin of which has to be traced backwards, it may be for many years."²⁸ Although Archer does not claim superiority for any of these three methods, he commends the latter two because they aid in relaxing the narrow limits of theatrical representation and enable the playwright to deal with a larger segment of human experience.²⁹ He gives preference to the last method which allows the reader or spectator to watch from where and how the drama arises.³⁰ It is by this method that L. Ukrayinka attacks her drama.

²⁷Aristotle, "The Poetics," p. 2924.

²⁸Archer, Play-making, p. 56.

²⁹Ibid., p. 73.

³⁰Ibid., p. 75.

(b) The Exposition. Boyarynya starts with a staccato opening, with an arresting, brisk and light introduction. The exposition is provided economically and with compression. At the outset it is conveyed who the characters are, where they are, from where the central figure has come, and gleams of his character are projected.

In the ideological duel between the protagonist and the antagonist, the time of the play and its relation to the past are revealed. Here the drama of the past, its facts and its emotions, are harmoniously blended into the drama of the present. The historical exposition is disclosed incidentally and is dramatized most effectively because each bit of the story of the past is provoked by the emotional discussion of the present. The verbal clash is not calculated to convey information only, it is calculated also to arrest attention to the information conveyed, to awaken interest in it, and to arouse anticipation in further events.

L. Ukrayinka might be criticized for basing her concise historical exposition on the assumption that the reader or spectator has a knowledge of the seventeenth-century Ukrainian-Muscovite and Ukrainian-Polish relations. Yet, the understanding of the historical complications involved is not absolutely essential to the understanding of the play, for it is in the final stage of the first act where the drama begins to germinate. "The ideal opening scene ought to be-- invaluable, yet not indispensable."³¹

³¹Ibid., p. 84.

(c) The First Act. Even though the first act should clearly place the situation before the reader or audience it is not the amount of information conveyed by this act that is essential but that the reader or spectator's interest is thoroughly aroused and skilfully carried forward.³² An interesting theme, a clear and crisp statement of preliminaries, and the development of the dramatic crisis are means by which interest is aroused,³³ while the art of foreknowledge is the fundamental constituent of dramatic interest:³⁴ the reader or spectator should know what the actors do not know, he should have "a clear vision of all the circumstances, relations, and implications of a certain conjecture of affairs, in which two, at least, of the persons concerned are ignorantly and blindly moving towards issues of which they do not dream."³⁵

In her first act, L. Ukrayinka does accomplish all these requirements of dramatic art. In the opening scene of Boyarynya the preliminaries are presented with consummate skill, the emotional discussion strongly enlists the reader or spectator's interest in the theme and in its further developments, and already in the closing scene the drama plainly declares itself. Here the theme is reinforced, some important characteristics of the main personages are revealed and attention is concentrated on the figures that will carry the action of the drama forward but, most important, a foresight into the future is afforded. The playwright defines, redefines, and contrasts the

³² Ibid., pp. 96, 100, 113.

³³ Ibid., p. 113.

³⁴ Ibid., pp. 101-112.

³⁵ Ibid., p. 110.

atmospheres of two locales so that a clear vision of the next setting is obtained; the heroine's premonitions add to the reader's or spectator's prevision of a crisis looming ahead. Therefore, enough insight into the story is provided so that the reader or audience grasps the true meaning and significance of the situation. The glimpse of the fate awaiting the heroes makes them of particular interest, the reader or audience is eager to learn how the heroes will react to the given situation. Thus, according to Aristotle's maxim, the beginning of Boyarynya gives rise to further action.

ii) The Middle

(a) Tension and its Suspension. The main object of the playwright's craft is to "engender, maintain, suspend, heighten and resolve a state of tension."³⁶ Tension is a stretching out, a stretching forward, of the mind and once this has set in it must not be relaxed but must be progressively heightened until it is resolved at the end of the play.³⁷ Sometimes tension is suspended momentarily: if so the suspension must be deliberate and purposeful, it should either clarify other matters of import to the reader or spectator or whet his appetite for what is to come.³⁸ In a serious play, however, the line of interest must be followed closely, there must not be any pause or break in the development of character and action.³⁹

³⁶Ibid., p. 125.

³⁷Ibid., pp. 125-126.

³⁸Ibid., pp. 128-130.

³⁹Ibid., p. 129.

Two mainsprings of tension are engendered in the first act of Boyarynya, one involving Stepan and the other Oksana. The tension concerning Stepan is temporarily suspended in Act II, while the interest in Oksana is maintained. During Act III, Scene 1, there is a brief respite from Oksana's crisis as attention is diverted to Stepan. In Act III, Scene 2, the two mainsprings are joined and tension accelerates until it reaches a high pitch at the end of Act IV.

L. Ukrayinka deals dexterously with the interplay of tension and its suspension. Each time that she suspends the tension from a crisis of one of the heroes, she does so to continue the development of the other character and the development of the action of the drama. Yet, the lines of interest follow each other without interruption and tension is never relaxed during its suspension. In Act II, for example, although tension revolves about Oksana, Stepan is not neglected, his character is incidentally developed until his reappearance for a brief portrayal in the last scene. Act III, Scene 1, picks up the development of his character, but there is only a momentary distraction (not relaxation) from the crisis which loomed over Oksana in the preceding scene. Simultaneously, as Stepan's character receives development, a giant stride is made in the furthering of the action in this very brief scene. Once the characters and the action are sufficiently developed for the author to embark upon the major dramatic crisis, the two mainsprings of tension are combined to work up to a height at the closing of the penultimate act.

(b) The Finger-posts. When the mind of the reader or spectator has been given something to which to stretch forward, it must not be permitted to feel that it has stretched forward in vain.⁴⁰ It is the art of foreshadowing, the provision of requisite finger-posts, that keeps anticipation on the alert and in the right direction.⁴¹ Finger-posts must not be misleading, nor should they be over-elaborate,⁴² for though the reader or spectator is given to know where he is going, he should be left to wonder how he will get there.⁴³ It is in this way that interest is carried forward in Boyarynya, successive finger-posts point to forthcoming events but do not reveal any secrets about the events.

In the first act, descriptions of the next setting and of Stepan's and Oksana's feelings for it are finger-posts that prepare the reader or audience for a change of scene, atmosphere and mood of the drama. At the close of the second act, after the reader or spectator has had a glimpse of this new setting, he is certain that the newly-weds' dream of weaving an ideal nest cannot be realized in such a setting, but how the tragedy will be materialized is not evident. No finger-post in the second act directs to the politics of the third act, but the reader or spectator should not feel misled, because the

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 131. Cf. Busfield, The Playwright's Art, p. 117.

⁴¹Archer, Play-making, pp. 133-135. Cf. Thomas Stearns Eliot, "Poetry and Drama" (1950), in Barrett H. Clark, European Theories of the Drama with a Supplement on the American Drama (New York: Crown Publishers, 1965), p. 468.

⁴²Archer, Play-making, pp. 137-138, 145.

⁴³Ibid., pp. 131-132.

finger-post lies in the very nature of the theme, which indicates that political affairs must be imminent. The political affairs, on the other hand, and the heroine's change in ideological viewpoint, foreshadowed in Act II, hint toward the theme's resolution. But even if one is aware of what the resolution may be, there is no indication as to how the play will be resolved, anticipation continues to be kept on the alert. Developments of the third act lead to an expectation of an obligatory scene, where the hero and villain should clash, but L. Ukrayinka surprisingly omits this scene. Instead, in the opening of the fourth act, one discovers that the hero has already encountered the villain and, as was assumed, has failed. The fourth act moves rapidly toward a tragic end, yet the reader or spectator still has no knowledge of how the tragedy will come about or how it will end. Thus the middle of Boyarynya, in accordance with Aristotle, gives rise to the end.

(c) The Obligatory Scene. An obligatory scene is the one "which the audience . . . foresees and desires, and the absence of which it may with reason resent."⁴⁴ According to Archer, five factors in a drama may necessitate an obligatory scene: 1) the inherent logic of the theme; 2) the manifest exigencies of specifically dramatic effect; 3) the finger-posts provided by the dramatist; 4) an important modification of character or alteration of will which must

⁴⁴Ibid., p. 148. Cf. Brander Matthews, "The Art of the Dramatist" (From "The Development of Drama," 1903) in Barrett H. Clark, European Theories, p. 475. (Francisque Sarcey maintains that the obligatory scene is essential.) See also Busfield, The Playwright's Art, pp. 117-118.

be justified; and 5) history or legend.⁴⁵

L. Ukrayinka dismisses the obligatory scene in Boyarynya. This scene would show Stepan encountering the tsar, and would take place between the existing third and fourth acts. According to the above definition and factors, respectively, such a scene may become obligatory because: 1) it would demonstrate the theme--the strength and honor of the pen and the sincere word; 2) it would produce a highly dramatic effect of the hero's clash with the villain at the colorful soirée; 3) in both scenes of Act III Stepan reassures that he will meet with the tsar; 4) Stepan's turning point occurs in the opening of Act IV; and 5) Boyarynya is a historical drama. (But this final point does not necessarily demand an obligatory scene, for although it is deduced that the tsar involved in the drama is Alexis I, Stepan is a fictitious character.)

A few reasons could be postulated as to why L. Ukrayinka chose not to place the obligatory scene on stage. The explanation also can follow the above-mentioned points, respectively. 1) The omission of such a scene does not hurt the logical development of the theme. The manner in which Stepan will face the villain is described in the preceding act while the outcome of the encounter is narrated in the following act. This method of theme development lends to the implicitness of the theme. 2) The obligatory scene may have been highly dramatic, but it may not have maintained and heightened a state of tension; it may have resulted in the climax of the drama, thereby

⁴⁵Archer, Play-making, pp. 148-149.

possibly producing an anti-climax for the remainder of it. The obligatory scene would not have demonstrated anything that the reader or spectator does not already well know, for the playwright has already given a clear and vivid picture of the soirée. A dramatization of it may not even compare to the excellent image already obtained.

L. Ukraïinka did not choose a less dramatic scene in place of the obligatory one, on the contrary, she chose a scene which is charged with emotion, which produces an unexpected degree of tension. The action proceeds directly into the peripety and, surprisingly, a great psychological drama unfolds. 3) The finger-posts in Act III are required to show in which direction the action is developing. The expectancy of the reader or spectator is not really balked, for in the beginning of Act IV the expected outcome is revealed in narration.

4) It was not as important to the playwright to show Stepan's actual defeat as it was to show the effects of that defeat. It is the psychological development of the drama that primarily concerned her. Furthermore, there is no overwhelming change in Stepan that might seem unnatural without a scene to show why a change had occurred, the forces that brought about Stepan's turning point are absolutely clear to the reader or audience. 5) It is not the character of Tsar Alexis I that is important to the development of the theme but the character of an oppressive government. Moreover, some historical figures, of which the tsar is no exception, "so thrill the imagination that their mere name can dominate the stage, better perhaps than their bodily presence."⁴⁶

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 166.

[Thus] there is such a thing as . . . a scene which at first sight seems obligatory, but is in fact much better taken for granted. It may be absolutely indispensable that it should be suggested to the mind of the audience, but neither indispensable nor advisable that it should be presented to their eyes. The judicious playwright will often ask himself, "Is it the actual substance of this scene that I require, or only its repercussion?"⁴⁷

L. Ukrayinka did make her choice judiciously, for it is the repercussions of the obligatory scene that result in the great psychological tragedy which follows.

(d) The Peripety. One of the most impressive things in drama is to see some characters "come upon the stage radiant, confident, assured . . . and leave it crushed and desperate, after a gradual and yet swift descent into Avernus. Such a scene is the very marrow of drama. It is a play within a play; a concentrated, quintessentiated crisis."⁴⁸ Peripety and discovery are the two most important elements of a tragedy and the most effective tragedy results from a plot which combines the two in a single action.⁴⁹ In Boyarynya, the major discovery occurs behind the scenes, but it precipitates a great psychological drama composed of a chain of discoveries and psychological vicissitudes that mark the penultimate act as the most arresting and most absorbing act of the play. A moral peripety is already underway as the curtain rises: Stepan's illusions have collapsed after his discovery that his voice in government council is unheard. As the inevitable consequences of his failure gnaw at his very soul, he discovers that his wife is falling into despair: the discovery of her

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 169.

⁴⁸Ibid., p. 172.

⁴⁹Aristotle, "The Poetics," p. 2924.

husband's defeat accelerates her descent. Oksana will not depart home alone as Stepan suggests: when she implores him to escape he utters an admission about his acquisition of material wealth. This crashing thunderbolt on Oksana is followed with a brilliant touch of theatrical craftsmanship--there is complete silence, dusk is settling, somewhere, far away, a bell is softly ringing. After a period of silence, Oksana sings for Stepan. It is discovered that she is not well. The tension is temporarily suspended by a diversion to Mother and Hanna's entrance. It is picked up again and heightened to the summit after the luxuries that they have bought and Mother's remarks about well-being trigger Oksana's emotional outburst, the ironic songs and boisterous dance, which leads to her paroxysm of coughing. Stepan is desolate at the drop of the curtain.

L. Ukrayinka's art of keeping a secret marks the success of this act. She knew just how long to keep the truth from Oksana and the reader or audience and she knew just the right moment to let it slip out. Stepan may have been suspected of his vice earlier, but his sincerity in his ideals befogged it. Mother and Hanna do not know what has befallen Oksana, only Stepan, the reader and spectator know the whole force of the irony during this heartrending but stupendous scene. "The true art lies in knowing just how long to keep silent, and just the right time to speak,"⁵⁰ as well as to whom to speak and to whom not to speak.

⁵⁰Archer, Play-making, p. 206.

iii) The End

Since crises are not inclined towards definite ends, the final act of the play provides the most difficulty for the playwright; the nearer that the playwright approaches reality the greater is his difficulty, and, the higher the form of drama the more probable is the clash between "the demands of truth and the requirements of dramatic effect."⁵¹ The difficulty may also lie in the theme. Some themes are conducive to emphatic or climactic endings while others, by their very nature, induce unemphatic or anticlimactic endings.

"Authors and critics . . . should . . . distinguish the themes which do, from the themes which do not, call for a definite, trenchant solution, and should handle them, and judge them, in accordance with their inherent quality."⁵²

The storm in the penultimate act in Boyarynya necessarily leads to the delusive calm of the opening of the fifth and final act. Oksana's grave illness demands the tranquility while tension is maintained by the concern for her, Stepan's and Mother's concern, as well as the reader's or spectator's. In the second scene tension progressively increases and in the third scene it quickly and most unexpectedly reaches the heights where it remains until the very close of the play. The successful, climactic ending, however, is not inherent in the theme,

⁵¹Ibid., pp. 211-212. Mamontov in quoting H. Freitag says that the resolution provides the most difficulty for the playwright since it follows the culminating point and the dramatist must find new means of sustaining the spectator's interest. See Mamontov, Teatral'na publitsystyka, pp. 53-54.

⁵²Archer, Play-making, pp. 212-213.

on the contrary. If L. Ukrayinka was not the expert social-psychologist that she is in Boyarynya, the theme would most likely have induced an anticlimax. Already the third and fourth acts demonstrate that in a totalitarian society the pen and a sincere word do not possess strength and honor; but it is not yet shown that the musket and sword do possess such qualities. To show that they do, the playwright could have proceeded to expound a battle and announce a victory for the rebels; she chose, instead, to expound an uprising which ends in total defeat and leaves the oppressed nation in complete devastation. For the answer to the theme question, L. Ukrayinka directs the reader or spectator to the tragic guilt and the mental anguish of the heroes--"the rusty scabbard" and "the rusty sword." Just before the fall of the curtain the theme question is fully answered, yet still implicitly, for it lies in Oksana's optimism in the reassemblage for battle. While L. Ukrayinka resolves all the pertinent questions that have arisen in the course of the drama, she probes into the very depths of human nature and brings the problems or flaws of the tragic heroes up to the fore and within the scope of the reader's or spectator's understanding and sympathy. This is "surely the highest privilege of art--to take us behind and beneath those surfaces of things which are apparent to the detective and the reporter, the juryman and the judge."⁵³

⁵³Ibid., p. 248. Cf. Baker, Dramatic Technique, pp. 237-239.

Not for a moment does this act escape reality. This is because the conversions, i.e. the changes of volition or resolve and the changes of sentiment, meet the demands of truth. "A change of resolve should never be due to mere lapse of time--to the necessity for bringing the curtain down. . . . It must always be rendered plausible by some new fact or new motive: some hitherto untried appeal to reason or emotion."⁵⁴ Stepan has, now, decided to return to his homeland. Not because he has suddenly been overwhelmed by some radical change of character, but because he must for the betterment of his wife's health as the doctor has advised. Stepan's very nature demands that he inquire only about a leave of absence rather than permanent residence and even in thinking about the leave he is fearful, indecisive and doubtful as to whether the tsar will grant it. Such a leave is plausible because the revolt has been crushed and the conquering ruler would not consider the boyar's intentions dangerous. Oksana, on the other hand, no longer wishes to return home because her feelings of guilt just simply will not permit her to face her loved ones. This feature of character, too, fits the proud personality that the playwright has created and developed.

"A change of will can always manifest itself in action; but it is very difficult to externalize convincingly a mere change of heart. When the conclusion of a play hinges . . . on a conversion of this nature . . . it should not merely be asserted, but proved."⁵⁵

⁵⁴Archer, Play-making, p. 219.

⁵⁵Ibid., pp. 219-220.

Oksana's change of heart is revealed in her reproach and in her final words to Stepan. She does not beg him to return home, as would be expected, but scolds that he dare not show his face in his homeland after the battle had been fought. Then she bids that he remain a boyar and aid his countrymen from this office because she is now fully aware, as is the reader and spectator, that Stepan, who is imbued with fear, was "not born a fighter." This was gradually and consistently developed throughout the drama. But L. Ukrayinka, the social-psychologist, does not abandon the hero to desolateness, for Stepan, in aiding his nation, will have regained its respect and thereby will have reacquired his self-respect.

Boyarynya closes with a model curtain. As soon as the playwright has made her successful exit from the maze of problems that she has set, Stepan takes Oksana's hand to help her indoors; before they reach the entrance of the house Oksana halts, turns to see the sun disappearing beyond the horizon, and says:

Goodnight, dear sun! Thou art westward bound
Thou seest Ukraine--give her my regards!⁵⁶

Like the beginning, the drama closes in a staccato ending. The curtain falls at an unexpected moment. To the very last line, tension is held at the summit. Yet, the curtain does not take the reader or audience entirely by surprise, for it is felt that Oksana's death is imminent. The dramatist did not choose the expediency of death to end the crisis in her drama. Instead, she allows the crisis to

⁵⁶L. Ukrayinka, Boyarynya, p. 154.

subside, naturally, by its own pace, after the fall of the curtain, while affording the reader or spectator a very tender, moving, and full close.

Therefore, accordant with the Aristotilean principles, L. Ukrayinka did not merely present last events in the end of Boyarynya. She presented last events that were necessary because of the preceding action and that did not give rise to new problems.⁵⁷

Finally, L. Ukrayinka's regard for the unities of action, time, and place⁵⁸ results in a tightly constructed play. A continual, logical, and rapid progression of the plot, the focus of interest on the tragic heroes, the endowing of each character with a particular function, and a balance between word, gesture, and silence account for the unity of action in Boyarynya. There is no periodical gap in the drama to threaten the unity of time. The action stretches over approximately a decade, beginning around 1665 and ending in 1676.

The unity of place is skilfully attained in spite of the fact that the drama is set in two different countries. The setting of the first act in Oksana's home in Ukraine and the subsequent setting in Stepan's and Oksana's home in Muscovy provide a necessary and vivid contrast of the two atmospheres. The contrasting settings are naturally blended by the political centralism in the background of the drama and by the marriage of the hero and heroine in its foreground.

⁵⁷See Aristotle, "The Poetics," p. 2924.

⁵⁸For the unities of action, time, and place see Archer, Play-making, p. 80, and Busfield, The Playwright's Art, pp. 42, 116.

Although the final four acts are compactly united in Stepan's home, diversity, color and interest are achieved by laying the scenes in various parts of his home--in the festively decorated living room, the terem, the remote room on the upper story, and the blooming Turkish-furnished alcove from which there is a view of the stairs and barred windows of the terem. L. Ukrayinka's remarkable insight into the basic components of play structure results in a solid and masterly construction of Boyarynya.

CHAPTER V

THE DIALOGUE IN BOYARYNYA

Dialogue in drama must function to advance the plot and to reveal character.¹ It is also essential that it be natural and appropriate to character, time and place, that it sound as if it is indeed real life conversation: at the same time, the dialogue must be selected and heightened speech, the inclusiveness and irrelevancies of real life conversations have no place in drama.² Poetry is furthest removed from natural conversation, but "poetry can make a play uniquely precise," for it "can express and define patterns of thought and feeling otherwise inexpressible and indefinable:"³ it should serve to intensify drama.⁴ Since people under tension tend to use descriptive

¹George Pierce Baker, Dramatic Technique (London: Jonathan Cape, [1919]), pp. 309-419. Cf. Cleanth Brooks and Robert B. Heilman, Understanding Drama (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1959), pp. 29-30; Roger M. Busfield (Jr.), The Playwright's Art: Stage, Radio, Television, Motion Pictures (New York: Harper and Bros. Publishers, 1958), p. 131; John Howard Lawson, Theory and Technique of Playwriting and Screenwriting (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1949), p. 288; Yakiv Mamontov, Teatral'na publitsystyka (Kiev: Mystetstvo, 1967), pp. 59-60; J. L. Styan, The Elements of Drama (London: Cambridge University Press, 1960), p. 12.

²Baker, Dramatic Technique, pp. 309-419; Brooks and Heilman, Understanding Drama, pp. 31-33; Busfield, The Playwright's Art, pp. 139-141; Mamontov, Teatral'na publitsytyka, pp. 149-174; Styan, The Elements . . ., p. 13; Brander Matthews, "The Art of the Dramatist," in Barnett H. Clark (ed.), European Theories of the Drama with a Supplement on the American Drama (New York: Crown Publishers, Inc., 1965), p. 476.

³Styan, The Elements . . ., pp. 26, 31-32. Cf. Lawson, Theory and Technique, pp. 291-293.

⁴Thomas Stearns Eliot, "Poetry and Drama," in Barnett H. Clark (ed.), European Theories of the Drama with a Supplement on the American Drama (New York: Crown Publishers, Inc., 1965), p. 463.

words and to speak in a sharply accentuated rhythm, poetry can be particularly effective in tragedy, where tension reaches an ultimate point;⁵ but whether the medium of expression in drama is prose or verse, the "chief effect of style and rhythm . . . should be unconscious."⁶

The dialogue in Boyarynya is progressive. Once the drama is set in motion the plot moves forward with haste, the lines in each scene develop the pertinent situation and lead towards the future.⁷ Brief and succinct passages, elliptic, connotative constructions, the imperative mood and powerful emotional supplements to words--as ironic songs and obstreperous dance--accelerate the drama, while longer passages with declarative run-on sentences and relatively complex metaphorical constructions impede the movement of the necessary scenes effectively.

In character revelation L. Ukrayinka's line illuminates the speaking character, the addressed character and the character about whom it is spoken: often the latter is one who remains behind the scenes but who is important to the life of the drama. All the auxiliary personages in Boyarynya function primarily to mirror gleams of character of the central figures⁸ and every personage, except Mrs. Perebiyny, sheds light on backstage figures. L. Ukrayinka endows each character

⁵Brooks and Heilman, Understanding Drama, p. 32.

⁶Eliot, "Poetry and Drama," p. 461.

⁷See "The Plot" in Chapter IV of this thesis.

⁸See "Auxiliary Characters" in Chapter IV of this thesis.

with his own peculiar dialogue, one which discloses his individual nature, and all his speeches are consistent with that nature.

The dialogue in L. Ukrayinka's tragedy is written in blank verse. It is fervently impassioned, deeply lyrical and exquisitely melodious; yet, without its analysis, the reader or auditor is not consciously aware of the poetic medium of its expression, the speech is not archaic or exotic, rhetorical or declamatory, formal or decorative, it is perfectly natural and vividly dramatic. A few quotations from each of the personages will serve to elucidate L. Ukrayinka's method of characterization and individualization as well as the genuine beauty, the naturalness of conversation and the essentially dramatic nature of her verse dialogue.

A. THE AUXILIARY CHARACTERS

In the first scene of the play, Oleksa Perebiyny, the chief expositor, maintains the dominant role. Compared with other speeches in this scene his are longer, more informative, more fluent, more complex and are composed of figurative folkloric phrases and the Cossack idiom. Their fluency and strength and their metaphorical beauty impart rank, age, wisdom, strength and composure to the character. A quotation from his longest passage relates how the boyars speak of Stepan:

boyaram, vydko, vzhe zapakh medok
ta varenuvka, otzhe rozdobrylys'
ta y movyly: "nekhay sobi parnishka

sydyt' u tebe khoch I do VID'yIZDu.
 NAVIshcho VIN NAm ZDAVsyA?"⁹

(It was clear that the mead and brandy already 'emitted its aroma' to the boyars [the boyars had already conceived a sudden desire for mead and brandy], so they became generous and said "Let the lad stay at thy [your] place even until departure. Of what use is he to us?"')

Enjambement, which holds the inertia of the phrase, and the quantitative stress, which is achieved by voiced consonants and open vowels to give a baritone effect, account for the fluency and strength of Perebiyny's dialogue. The penetration of the open vowels A and O in the first half of this quotation, in opposition to the penetration of the narrow vowel I in the latter half, delineates the speaker's very own speech from the one that he is imitating. This can be ascertained from the fact that the playwright twice uses the co-ordinating conjunction ta rather than i in Perebiyny's own words.¹⁰

The shortening of the last line to a trimeter, as opposed to thirteen pentametrical lines of the entire passage, marks its special importance. It performs well in culminating the disclosure of the character of the boyars and in expressing the degree of worth and dignity that Stepan receives among them, for the phrase is made particularly impetuous, energetic and ponderable by various poetic techniques--the imperative intonation; the placement of the most

⁹L. Ukrayinka, Boyarynya, in Tvory (New York: Tyshchenko and Bilous, 1954), Vol. VIII, p. 112. (The capital letters indicate alliteration and assonance.)

¹⁰In Ukrainian ta and i are used interchangeably to mean and. Sometimes ta conveys more emphasis. After a vowel, y [j] is used rather than i; in the above quotation, as in many passages in the play, two conjunctions ta and y are used together for emphasis.

significant word navishcho¹¹ in the main stress position; and, the resonant quality which is attained by the nasal consonants and the vowels A and I, by the force of the first two V's and by the power of zd in conjunction with the echoing [aw] in zdavsya.

Naturalness of Perebiyny's speech is effected by the use of idiomatic constructions and local vocabulary. The word zapakh (emitted its aroma) in the first phrase sounds decoratively poetic in the literal translation, but it is a commonly used expression. The reference to the alcoholic beverages and the Russian word parnishka (lad) lend local color too, and aid in characterizing the backstage characters. The coarseness and chauvinistic attitude of the boyars is further revealed in their impolite, familiar address u tebe (at 'thy' place).

Very appropriate to Perebiyny's character are the expressions which he draws from his Cossack career, as:

. . . zaberu tebe v polon
poky ne vyzvolyat' boyary,¹²

(. . . I'll take you prisoner, until the boyars free you,) while a discreet use of the diminutive or diminutive-like lexicon, as synashu ([dear] son) reveals his gentleness and affection.

Perebiyny's dialogue maintains its gentle and quiet strength throughout. Even in the second scene, when the conflict rages between Stepan and Ivan, Perebiyny's interjections remain cool and collected,

¹¹Navishcho zdavsya is idiomatic, it means of what use.

¹²L. Ukrayinka, Boyarynya, p. 112.

in the same enjambement and baritone, with the same appropriateness to his former career.¹³

Perebiyny's wife, the gracious hostess and mother, speaks but a few, very brief lines in each scene of Act I. Her speech is exceptionally mellifluous. In her command to Oksana a soft tone lends tenderness:

Pidy lysh, donyu, tam poshly Semena.¹⁴

(Go [then], [little] daughter, send Simon there.)

The salutation donyu ([little] daughter), embedded within the sentence, makes her appeal gentle and contributes to the rapid tempo of the line. Tenderness is also achieved by the diminutive form of salutation and by the common noun rather than a proper noun address. Light, harmonious syllables and the liquid L move the line along swiftly and smoothly. The almost whispering lysh in the unstressed position and the equally soft shly in the stressed position and both N's influence the musicality of the line.

Mrs. Perebiyny speaks in a smooth and delicate enjambement to the guest:

Chom ty lipshe
syudy ne pereviz matusi?¹⁵

(Why did you not better [sooner] bring your [dear] mother here?)

The narrow vowels and voiceless consonants move the line lightly and melodiously. The short form chom (why), which is a colloquialism,

¹³Ibid., pp. 114-116.

¹⁴Ibid.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 114.

rather than the literary form chomu, is used for melodic purposes. The inclusion of lipshe (better) makes the question more indirect or polite, and the diminutive for 'mother', matusi, adds to the polite and tender tonality of the query.

In contrast, the imperative tone is used towards her son who has provoked Mrs. Perebiyny by his rudeness:

nu y TY ZH TAKy! KHTO ZH TAK HOvORYT' z HOsTEm?¹⁶

([Oh, but you're]! Who speaks so with a guest?)

An exclamation is followed with an imperative interrogative, but Mrs. Perebiyny's anger does not deprive her dialogue of melody, on the contrary. Both anger and melody are transmitted by alliteration and assonance. The repetition of the emphatic particle zh, the sibilants S and Z, eight stops (six T's and two K's), a voiceless fricative KH, which is followed twice by its voiced counterpart H, impart indignation to the line, while the vowels--four Y sounds, four O's and two A's--impart melodiousness.

Ivan's antagonistic dialogue is composed of curt, caustic and bellicose lines that reveal his rebellious and aggressive nature. Even his lines to his sister and mother are brusque and rudely imperative, as:

Ba ni, ya tut. Davayte, mamO, yisty.¹⁷

(Why no, I'm here. Give, mother, to eat.)

In assailing Stepan about his father's oath to Muscovy, Ivan's words crash like a thunderbolt:

¹⁶Ibid., p. 116.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 113.

Mav komu derzhaty!
Lykhyj yikh spokusyv davaty slovo!¹⁸

(He had for whom to keep it! The devil tempted him to give his word!)

The dynamic stress on the first echo-like [maw] (which is followed by the resonant vowels O and U), the repeating of the nasal M in stressed positions, the sibilant ZH, the stops K, D, T, and the trill R make the first line deeply resonant and penetrating. In the next line intensity is attained by the stressed coarse metaphor lykhyj (devil) and by the sibilants that produce a hissing sound conformable with the character's ire. The brilliant use of assonance and alliteration intensify the irony in this line:

ta pevne. KRashche zRAdyty vKRAyinu!¹⁹

(Why certainly! Better to betray Ukraine!)

Alliteration and assonance blended with the anaphora chy aid Ivan to satirize, hiss, and chide in this passage:

ta, ZvYCHayne,
odnakovo, CHYyi lyZATY p'yATY
CHY lyadS'KI, CHY moSKovS'KI! . . .²⁰

(Why, of course, it is the same whose heels you lick, whether Polish, or Muscovite ! . . .)

Consistent with these lines is his longest passage-at-arms which is also in a broken and rapid rhythm and in the reproachful mood; the alliteration and assonance within it continues to befit his satire.²¹ Even Ivan's abrupt entrance and exit are of characterizing value.

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 114.

²⁰ Ibid.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²¹ Ibid., p. 115.

Mother, i.e. Stepan's mother, is the personification of folkloric wisdom. Her dialogue is saturated with aphoristic expressions and popular beliefs. She uses aphorisms for persuasive purposes, as, for example, the euphonic and metaphoric:

z vovkamy zhyj, po-vovchy j vyj . . .²²

(live with wolves, howl like wolves . . . [In Rome do as the Romans do]).

The syllable chy j harmonizes with the internal rhyme zhyj (live) and vyj (howl). The repeated syllable vov [vow] together with the word vyj and their respective stresses afford an onomatopaeic quality; they suggest a sound similar to wolf howling.

The graceful and often melancholic tones in which mother recalls popular beliefs and her regard for the national dress show her reverence toward tradition and point to the fact that Stepan did not dwell in a Russified home. Mother's religiosity too reminds of Stepan's upbringing. The diminutive and endearing lexicon penetrates Mother's speech to disclose her very affectionate nature, as the diminutives donen'ko ([dear, little] daughter) and holubon'ko ([dear, little] dove). She also utilizes adverbial diminutives, as vyhidnen'ko (comfortably) and harnen'ko (nicely).²³

Mother's dialogue is in a rapid tempo, which is effected by either short sentences or sentences interrupted by caesuras, as for example:

²²Ibid., p. 123.

²³The diminutive connotation of adverbs cannot be fully expressed in English.

a ty b yak dumala? . . // S'ohodn[i] v TSerkvi//
 SHCHo SHepotu bulo navkolo naS://
 "CHerkaSHenky!" // "KHoKHluSHy!"²⁴

(And how would you think? . . Today, in church, what
 whispers there were round about us? "Cherkashenky!"
 "Khokhlushy!")²⁵

There are four caesuras in this short passage. It is noteworthy that the repetition of sibilants and the voiceless fricative helps to dramatize the whispering gossip.

Hanna's is the simplest of all the dialogues in Boyarynya. It is consistent with her simple secluded life in the terem where she spends the time nibbling pumpkin seeds. In sharp contrast to the heroine's dialogue, Hanna's lacks emotional depth and figurative constructions. The most emotional passage that Hanna exclaims is the fearful beseeching:

Oy, sestrychko!
 Yakby ty znala, shcho za lyutyj did^
 otoy boyaryn! . . Ya tebe blahayu.
 Sestrychen'ko! Ne zahuby zh ty nas.^²⁶

(Oh, [little] sister! If only you knew what a cruel old man is that [particular] boyar! . . I beg you! [Dear, little] sister! Do not ruin us!)

Various methods of persuasion are at Hanna's command--two types of endearing, diminutive appeals; the pleading sentence ya tebe blahayu (I beg you); short exclamatory phrases and the exclamation oy (oh); the emphatic particle zh; the metaphorical epithet lyutyj did (cruel old man), which is the only descriptive phrase in Hanna's entire

²⁴L. Ukrayinka, Boyarynya, p. 123.

²⁵These are derogatives that the Russians used to call Ukrainians.

²⁶L. Ukrayinka, Boyarynya, pp. 132-133.

dialogue; and two lines that end in a stress due to the omission of the consistently used hypermeter.

Hanna's passages are generally short. They contain many brief questions and imperatives that move exposition along rapidly and negative particles that serve for emphasis. Hanna often speaks in incomplete sentences which nevertheless convey a full meaning: Some elliptic constructions convey sadness or bashfulness, while endearing diminutives, as sestrychen'ko ([dear, little] sister), complement her fawning nature. Although simple, Hanna's speech is not deprived of charm, grace and beautiful euphony. Her dialogue is like the final stroke of a painter's brush.

The Cossack guest in his narrative, expository dialogue draws heavily on idiomatic expressions. In his first passage, for example, each sentence contains an idiom.

TA TAm Taki nApAsTi, shcho kryj Bozhe!
I prosvitku nikomu ne dayut'
moskovs'ki posipaky! Vse nam v ochi
tiyeyu prysyahoyu tychut' . . . ²⁷

(Why, there is such violence there that God forbid! The Muscovite [bailliffs] leave no one in peace! They always upbraid us with the oath!)

The assonance and alliteration, the quantitative stress, and the enjambement immediately give stability to the character. This is especially felt when this passage is in its rightful context--after the broken rhythm of Stepan's preceding lines. These lines convey Stepan's anxiety:

²⁷Ibid., p. 134.

Os' tuta pohovorym, pane-brate,
bo znayesh, tam . . . tut bude zakhysnishe.²⁸

(We will talk right here, dear friend, because, you know,
there . . . here it will be safer.)

The order or disciplined fluidity in the Cossack's pattern of speech, in contrast to Stepan's, imparts boldness and disciplined control to the Cossack.

Thus each auxiliary character, regardless of the degree of his importance, possesses his own personalized dialogue which reflects his own personal nature. Old Perebiyny comes to life by the Cossack idiom, Mother by folkloric wisdom, Ivan by bitter satire, Hanna by simple charm, the guests by Cossack boldness and Mrs. Perebiyny by tender graciousness. A skilful manipulation of sounds even delineates Perebiyny's manner of speech from that of the boyars whom he describes. Every auxiliary character's dialogue, moreover, is absolutely natural, in fact, their lines could even be mistaken for prose. Nevertheless, the poetical devices, of which the reader or auditor is definitely unconscious, are utilized by the poet-dramatist to intensify their lines, to contribute freshness, vivacity and vigor to their dialogues.

B. THE ESSENTIAL CHARACTERS

In contrast to the language of the auxiliary personages, the essential characters speak in a deeply emotionally-colored and relatively complex metaphoric language. The tragic hero's and heroine's dialogues can be still further delineated according to their

²⁸Ibid.

individual characters.

i) Stepan

Stepan's earliest lines reflect his politeness in his manner of speaking to the members of the Perebiyny family as, for example, in the diminutive formal address pan-otchen'ku (honorable [father] sir). They also express his fear of the "old boyars"²⁹ and, in this vivid metaphorical contrast, his feelings about the free atmosphere in Ukraine as compared to the atmosphere in Muscovy:

Takyj polon mylishyj od vyzvolu.³⁰

(Such an imprisonment [i.e. his stay at Perebiyny's] is more pleasant than the liberation [i.e. his departure with the boyars].)

Stepan's exposition begins in a slow and steady declarative manner. The second expository passage ends in this way:

Na radi Pereyaslavs'kiy miy bat'ko
podavshy slovo ³¹za Moskvu, doderzhav
te slovo virne.

(At the Pereyaslav deliberations, my father, having given his word for Moscow, kept that word faithful.)

The repetition of slovo (word) conveys the importance that Stepan imparts in maintaining allegiance to Muscovy. This importance is further emphasized by (1) the dimetrical line which slovo holds in its second appearance, (2) the epithet virne (faithful), which carries especial significance due to its inverse position, (3) the demonstrative te (that), and (4) its immediate reinforcement in Ivan's

²⁹Ibid., p. 111.

³⁰Ibid., p. 112.

³¹Ibid., p. 114.

succeeding lines.

Stepan's dialogue often demands a different elocutionary stress than the stress that the iambic meter provides, for example, this line, when measured in iambic pentameter, reads:

zámíst' vĕsĕlŏshchĭv řĭdnŏhŏ kráyu,³²

while in actual speech it changes to the dactyllic rhythm:

zámíst' vĕsĕlŏshchĭv řĭdnŏhŏ kráyu.

Metrical variation is one of the factors that account for the livelier rhythm and tempo in Stepan's speech.

When Ivan first antagonizes the hero Stepan tries to restrain his anger, but the tempo of his dialogue already begins to accelerate, his tone becomes imperative and his language figurative. In a passage of four lines, one line loses the hypermeter and two "political" metaphors appear--tsars'koyi ruky (the tsar's hand) and pol's'koyi korony (the Polish Crown.)³³ When Stepan can no longer contain his anger, his defensive dialogue moves more rapidly, in a broken but energetic rhythm, which is attained by stressed syllables in conjunction with caesuras, as:

Ne za-dlya sobolív, // ne dlya kazný //³⁴

.

(Not for the sake of sables, not for the treasury.

.)

³²L. Ukrayinka, Boyarynya, p. 119.

³³Ibid., p. 114.

³⁴Ibid., p. 115. Kazna (treasury) is a Russian word that was thrust at Stepan by his antagonist to imply that Stepan is Russified.

An internal rhyme ne xotiv (did not want), voliv (willed); the three negatives ne; the imperative intonation; and euphony, also force the lines forward. Stepan's emotional tension, moreover, engenders a multitude of epithets: (the euphony of the lines stand out even in these few words) chuzhyM panaM (foreign lords), v Ridnim kRayu (in the native land), RIdniy viRI (to the native faith), PRyhnoBlenyM BRataM (to the oppressed brothers), tsarevu lasku (tsar's favor), staryi vin (old [is] he).

In the next passage Stepan draws on the Bible and on his father's teachings for the power of persuasion.³⁵ In addition, varied poetic devices are employed by the playwright to yield even greater power to the speaker. There are epithets preceding and following modified words: z pys'ma svyatoho (from the Holy Scripture), z yasnym okom, a ne z t'myanyM (with a bright eye and not a dim one); nebesnomu ottsevi (to the Heavenly Father). There is a comparison:

. . . ne tremtyachy mov Kayin

 koly tebe spytaye: "de tviy brat?"

([So that you are] not trembling like Cain . . . when He asks thee: "where is thy brother?")

This is immediately followed by the figurative phrase:

A yak zhe mozhu ya na Ukrayini
 zdiynyaty zbroyu tak, shchob ne ditknuty
 nikoly neyu brata? . . .

(And how can I wield weapons in Ukraine in such a way that I never touch my brother with them? . . .)

This device is in turn succeeded by the widely known metonymical lines:

³⁵L. Ukrayinka, Boyarynya, pp. 115-116.

I neVzhe
muSHket i SHablya mayut' bil'SHe syly
ta CHesty, nizh pero ta SHCHyre slovo?

(And really do the musket and the sword have more strength and honor than the pen and a sincere word?)

Stepan's anger gradually subsides in this passage. The voiceless sibilants in the above lines impart a soft tone to his mood. Immediately following, with the aid of two negative particles ni and ne, the stress-ending line, and the assonance and alliteration, Stepan, assuredly and emphatically, answers his own theme question:

Ni, uchENo mENE, shcho se NE ták!^

Stepan's language is at its poetic heights in the love scene. Poetry helps to dramatize his feelings for Oksana and for his homeland as he contrasts his lot with that of the youth in Ukraine and compares Oksana to a flower. The following fragment, for example, contains a comparison, two epithets (one inverse), and three metaphors.

A ya zh yak v'yazen', shcho na chas korotkyj
z temnytsi vyrvavsya i maye khutko
z veselym svitom znovu poproshchatys'
i rozkvitu ne maye chasu zhdaty.³⁶

(And I am like a prisoner, who for a short time has escaped from the dungeon [i.e. Muscovy] and has to soon part again with the happy world [i.e. Ukraine] and for the blossoming [i.e. Oksana] has no time to await.)

These lines are immediately followed with the beautiful analogy where Stepan compares his metaphoric flower, Oksana, to Ukraine. The alliteration and assonance contribute to the beauty of the lines:

meni Bula B ne dlya zABAvy kvitka,
ya BACHu v niy zhyttya i voli oBRAz
i KRAyu Ridnoho KRASu.

³⁶Ibid., p. 118.

(To me the flower would not be for amusement, I see in her the image of life and freedom and the beauty of the native land.)

Many epithets brighten Stepan's dialogue in this scene, as tsilym svitom (the whole world), z rozbytym sercem (with a broken heart), kokhanyi spohad (beloved memory), zustrich mylu (dear meeting), na shchyromu dozvilli (at sheer leisure), kokhannya virne (true love), svekrukhy lykhi (evil mothers-in-law). Metaphorical names, of course, as zore (star!) and serden'ko ([dear] heart) add tenderness to the love scene.

In Act II, upon his entrance to bid Oksana to welcome the boyars, Stepan's dialogue is unsophisticated;³⁷ but, at the first indication of anxiety epithets arise as persuasive tools. As his anxiety grows Stepan's language becomes more descriptive and thus more persuasive and the tempo accelerates--in one passage eight and one-half scolding lines are composed of two lengthy run-on sentences which contain colorful folkloric phraseologisms, epithets, metaphors and a comparison.³⁸

Stepan's broken opening line in Act III reveals his fear that his Cossack guest may be seen or heard. The remainder of Stepan's lines in this scene are narrative: they resume their natural tempo and rhythm and are devoid of metaphorical constructions,³⁹ except for two aphorisms which function to achieve compactness and clarity-- "Moskva sl'ozam ne viryt"⁴⁰ (Moscow does not believe in tears) and

³⁷Ibid., p. 131.

³⁸Ibid., p. 132.

³⁹Ibid., pp. 134-137.

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 135.

"skachy, vrazhe, yak pan nakazhe"⁴¹ ("dance to your master's tune").

When Oksana informs that a messenger from Ukraine has dispatched a request for money, Stepan's fear is again disclosed in sharp, imperative outbursts, as:

NE pošylAY. Kryj Bózhe! i NE dumAY!⁴²

(Don't send [it]. God forbid! And don't think [of it]!)

Three exclamations, internal rhyme, a repeated negative, an inserted exclamatory phrase, an echo effect of the stressed and unstressed ay and the elocutionary spondaic stresses, or hovering accents, give particular impetus to this line.

Stepan's fear, shock and vexation that Oksana should favor the Doroshenko uprising compel a one sentence reprimand that is five lines in length. A melodious epithet line, within the reprimand, underscores Stepan's negative attitude toward Doroshenko's politics and is Stepan's instrument of persuasion to convince Oksana that she retract her new political viewpoint:

a sya vIYNA NAypache bratovbiYNA⁴³

(and this war is especially fratricidal)

The emphatic conjunction a, the demonstrative sya, and the superlative naypache all add strength to the main signifier bratovbiyna (fratricidal).

⁴¹Ibid., p. 136.

⁴²Ibid., p. 137.

⁴³Ibid., p. 138.

Oksana's despair soon reverses Stepan's dialogue to its natural tempo and simplicity; he speaks in a gentle tone with tender appellations.⁴⁴ But at the close of the third act Stepan again resorts to persuasive powers, this time in the form of a hyperbole which contains also an epithet:

. . . Za tym Yakhnenkom
shpyhy moskovs'ki tsilym royem khodyat'.⁴⁵

(. . . Muscovite spies follow that Yakhnenko in an entire swarm [in swarms]).

The inversal of the epithet in shpyhy moskovs'ki (Muscovite spies) places particular emphasis on the modifier and culminates well Stepan's preceding description of the ferocities of the Muscovite system.

In Act IV wearisome, elliptic and incomplete phrases convey Stepan's sufferings of defeat and affliction and his feelings of sorrow and guilt for Oksana's despair. The tender melodic lines, wherein Stepan tells Oksana that she should revoke her marriage vows, is of particular pathos: (a playwright's remark indicates that his voice is breaking from grief)

. . . YA PRysyahu tobi vertayu . . .
I YA PROshu TEBE . . . PROsty mEnE . . .
SHCHO YA . . . TEBE VIDmovyv VID roDyny . . .
SHCHO YA . . .⁴⁶

(. . . I am returning the oath to you . . . And I beg you . . . forgive me . . . that I . . . dissuaded you from [your] family . . . that I . . .)

The consistent alternation of the first person pronouns with the second person pronouns and the almost anaphoric repetition of words and

⁴⁴Ibid., pp. 138-140.

⁴⁵Ibid., p. 140.

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 143.

syllables are especially effective not only in providing musicality for the lines but in helping to convey grief and sorrow and in arousing the same in the reader or auditor.

Particularly noteworthy is the playwright's care in delineating Stepan's own words from his mimicked tsar's words:

Ta shcho zh . . . niyak . . . Tsar kazhe: "prochytayem, podumayem" . . . Chuvaly vzhe my teye!⁴⁷

(Well what . . . no how . . . Tsar says: "we will read it through, we will think about it for awhile." . . . We've heard that already [before]!)

Whereas Stepan's own utterances are in rapid iamb, the tsar's words, although they do lie in the iambic scheme, produce a different rhythm in natural speech--prochytayem, podumayem (vv / vv / vv) contain two retarding anapestic feet with an additional pyrrhic foot.

In the final act the words for 'release'--pustyty and puskaty--play an important role in disclosing Stepan's character. In the dialogue between himself and Mother, Stepan repeatedly wonders whether the tsar will release him for a visit to Ukraine and his queries are reinforced by Mother's replies. The word 'release' is used six times in four successive passages and in each passage it appears in an indefinite phrase. The repetitions and the indefiniteness unveil Stepan's anxiety, fear, doubt and indecisiveness, for example:

Stepan. . . . chey zhe pustyt'?

(Stepan: . . . will he, [perhaps], release [me]?)

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 141.

Maty. Ta mozhe y pustyt'⁴⁸

(Mother: Why, maybe [he] will release [you])

In the last scene Stepan's dialogue to his ill Oksana is simple, soft and tender, and flows in its natural rhythm.⁴⁹ A shift to an imperative tone, due to pleading, increases the tempo of his dialogue⁵⁰ until Stepan's final long passage, wherein he diagnoses his position:

1. ta y shcho kartatysya slovamy, lyuba?
2. nas dölya tak uzhe skarala tyazhko,
3. shcho pevne y Boh prostyt' usi hrikhy.
4. KHTO kRov iz Ran teRyav, a my iz seRtsya.
5. KHTO zaslanyj, v tUrmU zamknUtyj bUv,
6. a mY nEsly kaydanY nEvYdYmi.
7. KHTO mav khvylyny shchastya v borot'bi,
8. A NAS vAZHkA StrASHNA duSHylA zmorA
9. i NAM NE vdileNo bulo SNAhy
10. tU zmOrU pOdOlaty⁵¹

1. (And why reproach yourself with words my love?
2. Fate has already punished us so heavily
3. that surely even God will forgive all our sins.
4. Some wiped blood from wounds, but we from our hearts.
5. Some were exiled, locked in prisons,
6. but we carried invisible chains.
7. Some had moments of fortune in battle
8. but a heavy horrible nightmare suffocated us,
9. and we were not imparted with the strength
10. to overpower that nightmare)

This passage is highly poetic and intensely dramatic. It consists of two major elements. The first constitutes the three contrasts which expose the difference between the physical torment of active participants in battle and the psychological torment of the passive tragic heroes (in lines 4, 5 and 6, 7 and 8). These contrasts brilliantly summarize how the heroes feel. The playwright probes still deeper

⁴⁸Ibid., p. 149.

⁴⁹Ibid., pp. 150-152.

⁵⁰Ibid., pp. 152-153.

⁵¹Ibid., p. 153.

into the psychology of her characters with the second major element of this passage--the metaphoric personification of zmora (nightmare), i.e. fear, which serves to explain why the tragic heroes behaved as they did. These two elements are further dramatized by various other poetic techniques. The contrasts are intensified by the metaphoric lines 4 and 6, by the stressed and inverse epithet kaydany nevydymi (invisible chains) in line 6, and by the anaphora khto (some) in lines 4, 5 and 7. The personification is intensified by two epithets vazhka, strashna (heavy, horrible) in line 8 and by the repetition of the personified word zmora in lines 8 and 10. The importance of the epithets is recognized by their placement in stressed positions and in positions away from the signified word. Their richness and sonority are due mainly to the repetition of the open vowel A and the sibilants within them. The importance of the personified word is emphasized not only by its reinforcement in line 10, but also by its stressed position in the trimetrical final line, which, although a silencing line that produces a decrescendo effect, is sustained by its quantitative vowels U, O and A. The entire passage, moreover, is rich in euphony. Only the most effective alliteration and assonance is marked above. The poeticism of this passage does not deprive the dialogue of naturalness and, yet, there seems to be a tone of artificiality in these lines. This lies, not in the poetic language, however, but in the rhythm of the verse. From lines 2 to 10 the uniform metrical alternation between the stress-ending line and the hypermeter-ending line and the sometimes mechanical iambic beat causes uneasiness in the reading of the passage.

Thus, with the above exception, every passage in Stepan's dialogue is natural. During moments of calm his language is simple and it flows in a lively, uneven rhythm. When the hero reaches his emotional heights, his dialogue is at its poetic heights and the rhythm and tempo is greatly accelerated. Many poetic devices aid to dramatize Stepan's innermost feelings--numerous epithets (mostly of folkloric origin), metaphors, comparisons, contrasts, aphorisms, hyperbola and personification. The sincerity that they impart yields great persuasive power on Oksana and on the reader or audience. But Stepan's dialogue is not monotonously metaphoric and lively. Simple and retarding elliptic phrases which are also imbued with emotion reveal Stepan's most distressing moments and convey his despair, a despair that the tragic hero finds, at the time, otherwise inexpressible.

ii) Oksana

Oksana's very few, brief introductory lines in the first two scenes of the play show that she is proud and outspoken. At the inception of the love scene Oksana's pride and frankness are emphatically underscored in her retort to Stepan for having taken her hand to hold her back:

se shcho za zvyhay?
ya ne kh010pka z VOTchyny TVOyeyi!⁵²

(What sort of custom is this? I'm not a serf of thy {your} domain!)

This social analogy is the first of a number of similar analogies that

⁵²Ibid., p. 118.

lucidly reveal Oksana's deep regard for freedom. Besides the satire, various other poetic techniques add vigor to the lines--the sibilants; the assonance and alliteration; the poignant use of the Russianisms kholopka (servant) and votchyna (domain) (which, moreover, lie in stressed positions); the inverse pronominal epithet votchyny tvoyeyi (thy domain); the imperative intonation of both sentences, and the different line lengths, which result in the crescendo effect of the last line.

In contrast to Stepan's emotionally-colored dialogue in the love scene, Oksana's surprise and bashfulness cause her to speak in a disquieted manner--in short, confused interrogatives and in incomplete remarks; but when she recollects herself she fluidly expresses her concern for her homeland.⁵³ Unlike Stepan, Oksana uses epithets very sparingly, yet the most brilliant use of this poetic device is found in the chain of epithets contained within the passage where Oksana expresses her ideology. She describes how she feels when a knight offers his hand to dance:

. . . a meni zdayet'sya,
shcho ta Ruka cheRvona vsya VID KROVY,
VID KROVY bRat'noyi⁵⁴

(. . . but to me it seems that that hand is red,
all from blood, from brother's blood)

The first epithet elicits an image, while each successive one serves to extend that image and to transfer significance to the one following, until the final epithet gains the most significance (red→ blood→ brother's blood). The repetition of words and the alliterated trill R

⁵³Ibid., pp. 118-119.

⁵⁴Ibid., p. 120.

impart additional vitality to the lines.

A sharp contrast between the knight's hand and Stepan's completes the above passage:

. . . Otsya ruka
vid krovny chysta.

(This hand is clean [free] from blood.)

There is not only a contrast between images here, but also between the methods of expressing them. The latter single epithet phrase, in contrast to the former harsh amplifying phrases, yields softness to the latter line, a softness appropriate to the described image and to Oksana's feelings for Stepan.

These impressive contrasting images function to illustrate and emphasize, clearly and compactly, the ideologies important to the drama. They are, time and again, recalled as the plot progresses until, in the resolution, Oksana contrasts them to another dynamic image:

Ot, zdayet'sya, ruky chysti,
prote vse maryt'sya, shcho yikh pokryla
ne krov, a tak . . . nemov yakas' irzha . . .
yak na starykh shablyakh buvaye, znayesh?⁵⁵

(So, it seems, our hands are clean, but then I always imagine that it is not blood that covered them, but so . . . as if some kind of rust . . . like on old sabre's it happens, you know?)

Another example of powerful imagery produced by a chain of epithets is the delightful passage wherein Oksana, in a dialogue with Mother, scorns the Muscovite dress; the first three lines refer to the gown:

⁵⁵Ibid., p. 151.

.
 A shcho zhinochYJ, to TAKYJ bAkHmATYJ,
 TA DOVHYJ-DOVHYJ, mOV popiVs'ka rYAsa!
 Azh sumno, YAk se YA YOho nadinu?
 OtO Y na holovu TAKYJ pidstok
 nadity treba? zap'YAsty oblychchYA?⁵⁶

(. . . but [then] the lady's, [it's] so [very] coarse,
and so [very] long, like the priest's cassock!
 It's even sad, how am I to put it on?
 And lo! I have to put such a sieve upon [my] head?
 And veil [my] face?)

The three epithets are culminated with a colorful comparison mov popivs'ka ryasa (like the priest's cassock). The repeating of the word dovhyj (long), rather than using a modifier for it, doubles the strength of the epithet, while the double repetition of its two diphthongs [ow] and [yj] produces length. The succeeding diphthongs [ow] in mov and [iw] in popivs'ka, and the three preceding ones [yj], as well as the assonant A and fricative KH in bakhmatyj (coarse), add to the lengthening effect. The iotated vowels, moreover, blend well with the diphthongs, and the three whole lines that are designated to describe the length of the gown also play a part. The repetition of takyj (such, so) and of the verb nadity (to put on) and the metaphor pidstok (sieve, i.e. headdress) serve for emphasis. The many emphatic words--a, to, ta, azh, oto and y, play an important role in the dynamics as well. (All the characters in Boyarynya use emphatic conjunctions and interjections effectively; but none know as many as does Oksana.)

⁵⁶Ibid., p. 125.

As the plot advances Oksana's dialogue increases in the use of social analogies which serve to transmit the heroine's perception of Muscovite life. Oksana compares the veiled women with Turks⁵⁷, she wonders why they hide from men as if from Tatars⁵⁸ and uses the metaphors nevolya busurmens'ka (infidel's captivity)⁵⁹ and kormyha (yoke)⁶⁰ for Muscovy. (Both heroes often use the metaphor nevolya (captivity) and refer to themselves as captives.) Oksana compares herself to a Tatar woman, her husband to a serf, and the tsar to a khan, in the following pungent reproach directed at Stepan. Alliteration, assonance, and repetition contribute to the pungency.

A shcho zh? KHI^BA zh ya tut ne yak tatarka
 Sy[d]zhu v nevoli? Ty KHI^BA ne KHodysh
 pid nohy SlatySya Svoyemu pANu,
 mov KHANovi? // Skriz' pali, // kanchuky . 61. //
 KHolopiv prodayut' . . . // Chym ne tatary?

(And what [then]? Am I really not like a Tatar woman sitting here in captivity? Do you [really] not go to prostrate yourself at your lord's feet, as to a khan? Everywhere stakes, knouts . . . slaves are sold . . . How, not Tatars?)

Another characteristic of Oksana's speech is the transition from a kind of syncopated rhythm to a tempestuous gush and from the tempestuousness back to a silencing syncopation. This becomes increasingly evident with each sign of Oksana's mounting despair. Just before the above passage, for example, Oksana speaks in suspensive elliptic phrases and then in the relatively flowing rhythm of the above outburst that culminates in an elliptic syncopated decrescendo. This

⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 124.

⁵⁸ Ibid., p. 126.

⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 132.

⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 152.

⁶¹ Ibid., p. 138.

elliptic rhythm continues for a short while until the next outburst of emotion:

Oy, choloviche! . . .
Ta y osoruZHna ZH sya meni Moskva. ⁶²

(Oy [my] husband! . . . And this Moscow is repulsive to me!)

Oksana is saying 'Moscow is repulsive,' but to dramatize the line, the playwright arms the heroine with various dynamics--the imperative intonation; an exclamatory phrase, which begins with the exclamation oy; an emphatic conjunction ta, which is strengthened by a second conjunction y; a rich and sonorous epithet osoruzhna, wherein each syllable receives quantitative stress; an emphatic particle zh, which is also alliterative; a demonstrative sya (this); a pronoun meni (to me); and a stress-ending final line. All these forces compel the line forward with great energy and point to the importance of the epithet osoruzhna (repulsive), which is still further emphasized by its stressed position and by its remoteness from the signified word.

Pity for Stepan, however, compels Oksana to retract the expression of her innermost feelings and again her dialogue becomes syncopated:

Ni, // moye kokhannya! //
Se ya nedobra! //⁶³

(No, my love! It is I [that is] no good!)

In the next act, Act IV, after the major peripety, Oksana can no longer contain her despair. An unrestrained flow of emotion again bursts forth and culminates in a synonymical crescendo line of

⁶²Ibid.

⁶³Ibid.

amplifying supplementary verbs:

Stepane! ty khibi zh ne bachysh?
Ya hynu, v'yanu, zhyty tak ne mozhu!⁶⁴

(Stepan! Can it really be that you do not see?
I am dying, withering, I cannot live like this!)

But again pity forces an accommodation of personal grief. When Stepan speaks about her departure to Ukraine, Oksana's love and compassion speaks for her:

Ni, // hodi, // ne kazhy! //
Ne znayesh ty . . . // shche zh ty meni (//) ni slova, //
ni slova (//) ne promovyv tam, // u bat'ka, //
.⁶⁵

(No, enough, don't say [it]! You don't know . . . You
still had not said a word, not a word there, at father's. . .)

Many caesuras, the repetitive tender use of the negatives ni and ne, the blandness of the repeated inversed ty (thou [you]) and the amplifying repetition of ni slova (not a word) account for the syncopation as well as for the romantic, compassionate, sincere and melodic tone.

Oksana's dialogue attains an ever increasing poignancy after her discovery that Stepan is bound to Muscovy. A gushing tempest of emotion is manifest in her explosively dramatic ironic song and dance scene in the closing of Act IV.⁶⁶ No dialogue could have transmitted, with such excellent compression, Oksana's deepest feelings and so electrify Stepan and the reader or audience. What is more, this

⁶⁴Ibid., pp. 142-143.

⁶⁵Ibid., p. 143.

⁶⁶Ibid., p. 146.

scene functions ironically to convey to the reader or audience a meaning different from that conveyed to Mother and Hanna.

In the opening of Act V, ill Oksana speaks in a calm, weak, syncopated rhythm⁶⁷ until Stepan irritates her with his concept of peace; a sudden burst of energy issues forth the sharp reprimand:

yAK ty KAzhesh?
utykhOmyRyLOs'? ZLOmyLas' vOLya,
ukRayina lyahla Moskvi pid nohy,
Se myR po-tvoyemu--ota RUyina?
Otak i ya UtykhomyRyUs' khUtko
v tRUni.⁶⁸

(How do [did] you say? Calmed down? Freedom has been broken, Ukraine has lain [fallen] under Moscow's feet, this is peace to you--that ruin? That is how I, too, shall soon calm down in the coffin.)

Various images imbue the passage with fervor--the double personification 'Ukraine has lain under Moscow's feet,' the sharp antithesis between peace and ruin, and the analogy and psychological personification of Ukraine. In this analogy Oksana compares Ukraine's "pacified" condition to her own individual self in a casket. Oksana's psychological being is ruined, but she will soon die or, as she says, "calm down in the coffin" and so Ukraine's psychological being or individual self (i.e. independence) is ruined and, therefore, it too is dead or "calmed down in the coffin" (i.e. in Muscovy). Other devices afford the verse its dramatic nature--a row of emotional interrogatives that are answered by the speaker, assonance and alliteration, the liquid L that accounts for fluidity, the trill R that so befits the anger, the sorrowful U, the repeated reinforcement of myr (peace), and the emphatic demonstrative

⁶⁷Ibid., pp. 147-148, 150.

⁶⁸Ibid., p. 150.

ota (that), which blends euphoniously with the emphatic adverb otak (that is how).

Even more poignant is the following passage which flows, without restraint, after a brief duration of syncopated speech:

1. a ya dyvuyu, ty Z yakym lyTSém^
2. ZbyrayeshSya Z'yavytyS' na vkrayini!
3. Sydiv-Sydiv u Zapichku moSkovS'kim
4. poky lylaSya krov, poky Zmahannya
5. veloSya Za ZHYttya tam na vkrayini, -- //
6. teper,//yak "vtykhomryloS'" ty yideSH
7. toho yaSnoho SonTSya ZAZHYvaty,
8. SHCHo ne diStaly Ruky ZAhRebuSHCHi,
9. ta hayem nepodolanyv vtISHatyS'.
10. na POZHARyni khoCHESH POdyvytyS',
11. CHY tam SHyROko ROZlylySya Riky
12. vid SliZ ta kROvy? . . . ⁶⁹

1. (And I'm astonished with what kind of face
2. you are preparing to appear in Ukraine!
3. [You] sat [and] sat in the Muscovite inglenook
4. while the blood flowed, while a struggle
5. for life was being waged there in Ukraine--
6. now, when it has "calmed down" you are going
7. to enjoy that bright sun
8. that the greedy hands did not get
9. and to delight with the unvanquished grove.
10. You want to take a look at where the conflagrations raged
11. whether, there, those rivers widely flowed
12. from tears and blood? . . .)

Pungency is attained by various means--by the alliteration and assonance (especially by the brilliant performance of the sibilants and the trill R); the overall euphony which carries the lines through swiftly; the iotations in line 1 which give a rapid, fluid start; the stressed labial-nasal endings yakýM lytséM (with what kind of face) and the stress-ending in line 1; the double sydiv (sat), the bitter sarcasm of the colorful image zapichok (inglenook) and its inverse epithet

⁶⁹Ibid., pp. 150-151.

u zapichku moskovs'kim (in the Muscovite inglenook) in line 3. (The diminutive word zapichok makes the phrase even more poignant.)

Dynamism is further attained by the anaphoric type poky (while) in line 4; the repetition of na Vkrayini (in Ukraine) in lines 2 and 5; the surprising caesura that halts but a single foot and the use of Stepan's term "vtykhomyrylos'" in line 6; the epithet yasnoho (bright) in line 7; the metaphor ruky (hands, i.e. Muscovy) described by a sonorous inverse epithet ruky zahrebushchi (greedy hands) in line 8; and, the inverse epithet hayem nepodolanym (unvanquished grove) in line 9. The short verb forms vtishatys' (to delight) and podyvytys' (to take a look) in lines 9 and 10 also dramatize the passage as do the emphatic adverb tam (there) in lines 5 and 10, the emphatic conjunctions a and ta (and) in lines 1, 9 and 12, the stressed position of the adverb shyroko (widely), which adds to the perception of width in line 11, and, the hyperbolic metaphor 'rivers from tears and blood' of lines 11 and 12. The final dimeter, which serves to silence Oksana and, in bringing her to tears, reveals the psychological state of the heroine.

Syncopated speech resumes when Oksana contrasts the images of "clean" and "rusty hands." An analogy wherein she compares herself and Stepan with a rusty scabbard and sabre is in a markedly slow and weak lacerated dialogue:

U baten'ka bula taka shablyuka . . .
 vony yiyi zakynuly . . . my z bratom
 znayshly . . . v viynu pobavytys' khotily . . .
 ne vytyahly . . . do pikhvy prykypila . . .
 zarzhavila . . . Otak i my z toboyu . . .

zroslys', mov shablya z pikhvoyu . . . naviky . . .
 oboye rzhavi . . .⁷⁰

(At father's there was such a sabre . . . he misplaced it . . .
 my brother and I found it . . . we wanted to play war . . . we
 didn't draw it out . . . it was affixed to the scabbard . . .
 rusted . . . And so you and I . . . grown together, as the
 sabre with the scabbard . . . forever . . . both rusty . . .)

This rhythm of speech continues until Stepan concedes their guilt.⁷¹

Oksana's dialogue then becomes calm, flowing and tender while a momentary feeling of peace and harmony overwhelms her. It ends in a gentle apostrophe, rich with feminine grace and tenderness:

Dobranich, sonechko! idesh na zakhid . . .
 Ty bachysh Ukrayinu--pryvitay!⁷²

(Good night, dear sun! Thou art westward bound . . .
 Thou seest Ukraine--give her my regards!)

Thus, whereas Stepan's language is figurative, Oksana's is, in the main, imagery. Her dialogue is composed of forceful image-provoking contrasts and analogies whose suddenness and inventiveness and unusual poignancy give especial life and vigor to the drama. Oksana's dialogue is natural throughout, even the most poetic passages sound like real life conversations and the undulating rhythm of her verse is ingeniously consistent with her compassionate and fervent nature.

Boyarynya possesses a great beauty of language and thought. The verse medium, with its laconic precision, rich images, and brilliant color, sharpens the clarity and deepens the meaning of the lines and so yields a great dramatic power: the most poetic moments are the most

⁷⁰Ibid., pp. 151-152.

⁷¹Ibid., p. 153.

⁷²Ibid., p. 154.

dramatic moments. The beauty of the language and thought, however, does not exempt the play from reality. The reader or auditor does not consciously attend to the poetry but attends to the meaning that the poetry conveys. The naturalness of the dialogue stems chiefly from its folkloric base, it is for this reason that the most poetic passage in the play is not complex; but neither is the least figurative one commonplace, stale or ineffective, because various poetic techniques are utilized to intensify every single line. Naturalness is further attained by the congeniality between dialogue and character. There is a sharp delineation not only between the auxiliary characters and the essential characters in general, but between each of the auxiliary personages and between both heroes. Even the backstage characters become vividly alive by the careful manipulation of sounds and the rhythm of speech in the mimicking dialogues of the personages. Not less outstanding is the exquisite musical design in every passage and the beautiful harmony between the passages. The playwright draws in every sound to participate in the melody and so to move the drama on smoothly and rapidly.

Thus the dialogue in Boyarynya is that quality which gives the drama its "life and magnetism."⁷³ Hot violent words, sudden contrasts, pauses, moments of unexpected calm and moments of unexpected emotional explosiveness are further accompanied by appropriate gestures and stage techniques that supplement words. Short euphonic passages and the

⁷³ Dialogue is thus described by Busfield in The Playwright's Art, p. 122.

frequent entrance and exit of characters account for rapid scenic changes and swift-moving acts. Yet, the earliest review of Boyarynya states a complaint that there is a lack of action in the play.⁷⁴ Even the great exponent of action in drama, George Pierce Baker, advises that "marked mental activity may be quite as dramatic as mere physical action,"⁷⁵ and that it is "good characterization and wisely chosen words" that are necessary for great activity.⁷⁶ There is also the complaint that the heroes in Boyarynya do not function.⁷⁷ But according to Baker even complete inaction, physical or mental, can arouse emotion in the spectator.⁷⁸ "If the dramatist can make an audience feel the terrible tragedy of the contrast between what might have been and what is . . . he rouses emotion in his hearers, and in so doing makes his material dramatic."⁷⁹ This is the essence of the tragedy in Boyarynya--"the contrast between what might have been and

⁷⁴V. Strashkevych, Knyhar, No. 10 (1918), p. 604, cited by Mykhaylo Dray-Khmara, "Boyarynya," in Tvory (New York: Tyshchenko and Bilous, 1954), Vol. VIII, p. 87.

⁷⁵Baker, Dramatic Technique, p. 36. See also Busfield, The Playwright's Art, pp. 125-126; Styran, The Elements . . ., pp. 79-80; Mamontov, Teatral'na publitsystyka, pp. 228-229 and "Drama," Encyclopaedia Britannica (29th ed.), Vol. VII, p. 576.

⁷⁶Baker, Dramatic Technique, p. 37.

⁷⁷Oleh Babyshkin, "Lesya Ukrayinka," Tvory v desyaty tomakh (Kiev: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oyi literatury, 1963-1965), Vol. I, p. 31; and Oleh Babyshkin and Varvara Kurashova, Lesya Ukrayinka (Kiev: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oyi literatury, 1955), p. 436.

⁷⁸Baker, Dramatic Technique, pp. 41, 44.

⁷⁹Ibid., p. 41.

what is"--and whether Boyarynya is evaluated by its capability of arousing interest in an audience or by its capability of arousing emotion⁸⁰ it is, without question, a dramatic play.

⁸⁰While William Archer and J. L. Styan contend that a play is dramatic when it arouses interest in an audience, George Pierce Baker adds the arousing of emotion to the awakening of interest. See Archer, Play-making: A Manual of Craftsmanship (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1960), p. 32; Styan, The Elements . . ., p. 65, and Baker, Dramatic Technique, p. 28.

CONCLUSIONS

With the development of the plot in Boyarynya, the tragic pacifist heroes fail in their pacificatory attempts to gain benefits for their nation from an autocratic imperialistic power. In due time their nation becomes an absolute vassal of that power.

The sociological element--the totalitarian society in which the heroes live, in conjunction with the psychological forces, i.e. the boyar's fear in that society and the boyarynya's compassion for her husband, are the indubitable causes of their personal tragedy. This tragedy is manifest in their feelings of guilt for their stagnancy during their nation's struggle for independence. Feelings of inadequacy, worthlessness, and self-contempt destroy the heroine's desire to fight with death which is advancing with tuberculosis. She believes that only in dying she can prove their wrong in maintaining their pacifist ideals. Her last testament will reveal their anguish and guilt. The boyarynya is optimistic in the resurrection of her nation and that her husband, who must remain in his conciliatory post, will aid his countrymen to recover strength for that day and in doing so will regain a favorable image in the eyes of his nation. But even if he should not acquire such a social image then, at least, he will have regained a favorable self-image.

This plot brilliantly illustrates L. Ukrayinka's basic theme that the musket and the sword possess more strength and honor than the pen and a sincere word. This is a theme that should provoke controversies in every mind and each resolves it, as the heroes in Boyarynya, according to his own conscience.

L. Ukrayinka is a meticulous craftsman of plot construction. Boyarynya should fascinate an audience from the illusively serene opening curtain to the dramatic close. Interest, emotion, and anticipation which are aroused at the outset are carried forward from act to act with extraordinary dexterity--the theme and exposition are implicitly stated and dramatically effected; each act contains brisk, bright scenes; each act contains a subordinate crisis that contributes to the main crisis; each act has an interest and individuality of its own while it functions as an integral part of the whole; and, with the art of foreknowledge, each evolves a bridge to the other act and ultimately to the climactic curtain.

L. Ukrayinka's genius also reveals itself in her mastery of dialogue and character creation and development. Personalized dialogues identify every character by his individual traits. Each personage differs in his manner of expression, intonation, melodiousness of voice, and in the emotional coloring, tempo and rhythm of the language. Incandescent poetry, which is marked with masculine potency and with feminine tenderness, attains utmost intensification of the drama. The playwright's understanding and acceptance of individual personality and behavior and her explorations for the influence or effects of society on the individual distinguish her as an expert in social-psychology and Boyarynya as a great realistic drama.

Whereas the social-psychological forces in action in the drama are plausible, every historical and sociological factor is verifiable. The scenes, costumes, language, customs, and historical events are

carefully depicted. The drama contains no anachronisms or inconsistencies in regard to local colorings.

The remarkable regard for truth in Boyarynya involves, above all, dramatic verisimilitude, for the play is a realistic illusion, a representation of life. A vital theme is illustrated by a plausible plot that carries conviction. The characters are vividly real individuals who provoke sympathy and compassion in the reader or spectator, and, thus, his participation in their affairs. Their natural, logical and dynamic dialogues and actions endow upon them the potential to speak and to convince men of different ages and different places.

Even though a play should not be judged finally until it has been interpreted on the stage, an examination of Boyarynya in terms of universal criteria of dramatic composition provides evidence that this poetic drama is undoubtedly a brilliant achievement of dramatic art. Its inherent qualities, in both its content and form, promote Boyarynya to the ranks of excellent drama and make L. Ukrayinka a literary figure worthy of further investigation.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. PRIMARY SOURCES

1. Literary Works

Skovoroda, Hryhory. "Pisn' X," Antolohiya ukrayins'koyi poeziyi v 4-kh tomakh, I. Edited by Maksym Ryl'sky. Kiev: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oyi literatury, 1958, p. 71.

Ukrayinka, Lesya. "And thou, like Israel . . .," Selected Works. Translated by Vera Rich. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1968, pp. 257-258.

_____. Boyarynya. In Tvory, VIII. New York: Tyshchenko and Bilous Publishing Co., 1954, pp. 111-154.

_____. "I ty kolys' borolas' mov Izrayil' . . .," Tvory v desyaty tomakh, I. Edited by Oleh Babyshkin. Kiev: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oyi literatury, 1963-1965, p. 334.

_____. "Na rokovyny Shevchenka," Tvory v desyaty tomakh, I. Edited by Oleh Babyshkin. Kiev: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oyi literatury, 1963-1965, pp. 65-66.

Ukrainka, Lesya. "The Noblewoman," Spirit of Flame: A Collection of Works. Translated by Percival Cundy. New York: Bookman Associates, 1950, pp. 111-168.

Ukrayinka, Lesya. Tvory v desyaty tomakh. Edited by Oleh Babyshkin. Kiev: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oyi literatury, 1963-1965.

_____. Tvory. Edited by B. Yakubs'ky. 12 vols. Kiev: Knyhospilka, 1927-1930. Reproduced in New York: Tyshchenko and Bilous Publishing Co., 1953-1954.

2. Letters

Ukrayinka, Lesya. "To A. Y. Kryms'ky" (Oct. 14, 1911), Tvory v desyaty tomakh, X. Edited by Oleh Babyshkin. Kiev: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oyi literatury, 1963-1965, pp. 318-321.

_____. "To A. Y. Kryms'ky" (May 24, 1912), Tvory v desyaty tomakh, X. Edited by Oleh Babyshkin. Kiev: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oyi literatury, 1963-1965, pp. 333-336.

_____. "To I. Y. Franko" (Jan. 13, 1903), Tvory v desyaty tomakh, X. Edited by Oleh Babyshkin. Kiev: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oyi literatury, 1963-1965, pp. 102-111.

_____. "To O. S. Makovey" (May 28, 1893), Tvory v desyaty tomakh, IX. Edited by Oleh Babyshkin. Kiev: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oyi literatury, 1963-1965, pp. 123-125.

_____. "To M. I. Pavlyk" (April, 1895), Tvory v desyaty tomakh, IX. Edited by Oleh Babyshkin. Kiev: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oyi literatury, 1963-1965, pp. 223-224.

B. BOOKS

Archer, William. Play-making: A Manual of Craftsmanship. New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1960.

Avrakhov, Hryhory H. Khudozhnya maysternist' Lesi Ukrayinky: liryka. Kiev: Radyans'ka shkola, 1964.

Babyshkin, Oleh, and Kurashova, Varvara. Lesya Ukrayinka. Kiev: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oyi literatury, 1955.

Baker, George Pierce. Dramatic Technique. London: Jonathan Cape, [1919].

Bilets'ky, Leonid. Try syl'vetky. Winnipeg: Soyuz Ukrayinok Kanady, 1951.

Brooks, Cleanth, and Heilman, Robert B. Understanding Drama. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1959.

Bulavyts'ka, M. V. Lesya Ukrayinka: bibliohrafichny pokazhchyk. Kiev: Akademiya nauk Ukr. RSR., 1956.

Busfield, Roger M. (Jr.). The Playwright's Art: Stage, Radio, Television, Motion Pictures. New York: Harper and Bros. Publishers, 1958.

Deych, A. Lesya Ukrainka. Moscow: Gosudarstvennoye izdatel'stvo khudozhestvennoy literatury, 1954.

Dontsov, Dmytro. Poetka vohnyanykh mezh: Olena Teliha. Toronto: Homin Ukrayiny, 1953.

Doroshkevych, O. K. Pidruchnyk istoriyi ukrayins'koyi literatury. Kiev, 1927.

Elnett, E. Historic Origin and Social Development of Family Life in Russia. New York: Columbia University Press, 1926.

- Halle, F. W. Women in Soviet Russia. New York: Viking Press, 1935.
- Kaspruk, A. Lesya Ukrayinka: literaturny portret. Kiev: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khydozhn'oyi literatury, 1958.
- Kostenko, Anatol' I. (ed.). Spohady pro Lesyu Ukrayinku. Kiev: Radyans'ky pys'mennyk, 1963.
- Kukhalashvili, K. P. Lesya Ukrayinka--publitsyst. Kiev: Dnipro, 1965.
- Kulins'ka, Lelya P. Poetyka Lesi Ukrayinky. Kiev: Kyivivs'ky universytet, [1967].
- Lawson, John Howard. Theory and Technique of Playwriting and Screenwriting. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1949.
- Mamontov, Yakiv. Teatral'na publitsystyka. Kiev: Mystetstvo, 1967.
- Mandryka, Hanna. Vybrane. Winnipeg: Komitet Ukrayinok Kanady, 1962.
- Marx, Milton. The Enjoyment of Drama. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1961.
- Mersand, J. The Play's the Thing. New York: The Modern Chapbooks, 1948.
- Mirsky, D. S. Russia: A Social History. London: The Cresset Press, 1942.
- Ohloblyn-Hlobenko, Mykola. Istoryko-literaturni staty. Zapysky naukovoho tovarystva imeny Shevchenka, CLXVII. New York, 1958.
- Prokopiw, Orysia. The Ukrainians: An Outline History. Calgary: The Centennial Ukrainian Committee, 1967.
- Radzykevych, Volodymyr. Istoriya ukrayins'koyi literatury. Nova doba, III. Detroit: Bat'kivshchyna, 1956.
- _____. Istoriya ukrayins'koyi literatury. Pidruchnyk dlya shkil i kursiv ukrayinoznavstva. New York: Shkil'na Rada, 1964.
- Riasanovsky, Nicholas V. A History of Russia. New York: Oxford University Press, 1963.
- Styan, J. L. The Elements of Drama. London: Cambridge University Press, 1960.
- Zadesnyans'ky, R. [Mlynovets'ky, Roman]. Lesya Ukrayinka. N.p.: Ukrayins'ka krytychna dumka, 1945.
- Zerov, Mykola. Do dzherel. Krakiv-L'viv: Ukrayins'ke vydavnytstvo, 1943, pp. 149-186.

Zhdanovych, O. (ed.). Prapory dukha. Zhyttya i tvorchist' O. Telihi.
N.p.: Surma, 1947.

C. ESSAYS AND ARTICLES

Andrusyshen, C. H., and Kirkconnell, W. "Lesya Ukrainka," The Ukrainian Poets, 1189-1962. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1963, pp. 254-255.

Aristotle. "The Poetics," Masterplots, XI. Edited by Frank N. Magill. New York: Salem Press, 1964, pp. 2923-25.

Babushkin, Oleh. "Mystets'ky svit Lesi Ukrayinky." In Lesya Ukrayinka, Pro mystetstvo. Kiev: Mystetstvo, 1966, pp. 7-34.

_____. "Mystets'ky svit Lesi Ukrayinky," Ukrayins'ka mova i literatura v shkoli, No. 1 (January, 1966), pp. 15-24.

_____. "Slovo pro Lesyu (Do 50-richchya z dnya smerti)," Ukrayins'ka mova i literatura v shkoli, No. 6 (August, 1963), pp. 7-13.

_____. "Z psykholohiyi tvorchosti Lesi Ukrayinky," Ukrayins'ka mova i literatura v shkoli, No. 10 (October, 1966), pp. 7-11.

Bida, Constantine. "Life and Work." In Lesya Ukrainka, Selected Works. Translated by Vera Rich. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1968, pp. 3-84.

Bilets'ky, O. I. "Lesya Ukrayinka i rosiys'ka literatura 80-90rr.," Vid davnyiny do suchasnosti, II. Kiev: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oyi literatury, 1960, pp. 257-278.

Bozhenko, M. K. "Dramatychni poemy Lesi Ukrayinky," Ukrayins'ka mova i literatura v shkoli, No. 9 (September, 1966), pp. 10-15.

Cundy, Percival. "Introduction." In Lesya Ukrainka, Spirit of Flame: A Collection of Works. New York: Bookman Associates, 1950, pp. 17-37.

Deych, Oleksandr. "Ostannya drama Lesi Ukrayinky." In Lesya Ukrayinka, Publikatsiyi, statti, doslidzhennya, II. Kiev: Akademiya nauk Ukr. RSR, 1956, pp. 370-387.

"Drama," Encyclopaedia Britannica (29th ed.), Vol. VII, pp. 576-578.

Dray-Khmara, Mykhaylo. "Boyarynya." In Lesya Ukrayinka, Tvory. New York: Tyshchenko and Bilous Publishing Co., 1954, Vol. VIII, pp. 87-109.

- Eliot, Thomas Stearns. "Poetry and Drama," (1950). In Barrett H. Clark, European Theories of the Drama with a Supplement on the American Drama. New York: Crown Publishers, Inc., 1965, pp. 460-470.
- Franko, Ivan. "Lesya Ukrayinka," Tvory v dvadtsyaty tomakh, XVII. Kiev: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oyi literatury, 1950-1956, pp. 237-255.
- _____. "Lesya Ukrayinka," Tvory v dvadtsyaty tomakh, XVII. Kiev: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oyi literatury, 1950-1956, pp. 262-263.
- _____. "Z ostannikh desyatylyt' XIX v.," Literaturno-krytychni statti. Kiev: Derzhlitvydav, 1950, pp. 332-347.
- Hlobenko, N. [Mykola Ohloblyn]. "Lesia Ukrainka," Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopaedia, Vol. I, pp. 1040-1041. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1963.
- Hranat, Kasiyan. "Zustrich z Leseyu Ukrayinkoyu," Spohady pro Lesyu Ukrayinku. Kiev: Radyans'ky pys'mennyk, 1963, pp. 211-219.
- Krupnytsky, B. "The Period of Ruin," Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopaedia, Vol. I, pp. 642-649. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1963.
- Kurashova, Varvara. "Materiyaly do naukovoï biohrafiï Lesi Ukrayinky (Dytyachi y molodi lita. 1871-1896 rr.)." In Lesya Ukrayinka, Publikatsiyi, statti, doslidzhennya, I. Kiev: Akademiya nauk, Ukr. RSR, 1954, pp. 195-234.
- _____. "Peresliduvannya tvoriv Lesi Ukrayinky tsars'koyu tsenzuroyu." In Lesya Ukrayinka, Publikatsiyi, statti, doslidzhennya, II. Kiev: Akademiya nauk Ukr. RSR, 1956, pp. 453-485.
- Matthews, Brander. "The Art of the Dramatist," (From "The Development of Drama," 1903). In Barrett H. Clark. European Theories of the Drama with a Supplement on the American Drama. New York: Crown Publishers, Inc., 1965, pp. 473-476.
- Mishchenko, Leonila I. Lesya Ukrayinka v literaturnomu zhytti. Kiev: Dnipro, 1964.
- Odarchenko, Petro. Foreword. In Lesya Ukrayinka, Tvory, I. New York: Tyshchenko and Bilous Publishing Co., 1953-1954, pp. xi-xxxxi.
- _____. "Lesya Ukrayinka i M.P. Drahomaniv (Do pytannya pro vplyv M.P. Drahomanova na Lesyu Ukrayinku)." In Lesya Ukrayinka, Tvory, III. New York: Tyshchenko and Bilous Publishing Co., 1953-1954, pp. 9-47.

- _____. "Lesya Ukrayinka v radyans'kiy literaturniy krytytsi," Suchasnist', No. 4[28] (April, 1963), pp. 43-68.
- _____. "Pereklady Lesi Ukrayinky z Bibliyi," Nasha kul'tura, No. 1 and No. 2 (1951), pp. 22-25 and 22-27, respectively.
- _____. "Taras Shevchenko i Lesya Ukrayinka," Suchasnist', No. 4[16] (April, 1962), pp. 24-44.
- [Ohloblyn-] Hlobenko, Mykola. "Na shlyakhakh fal'syfikatsiyi," Z literaturoznavchoyi spadshchyny. Paris: Natsionalistychne vydavnytstvo v Evropi, 1961, pp. 174-195.
- Padalka, N. I. "Dramaturhiya Lesi Ukrayinky ta yiyi vyvchennya v shkoli," Lesya Ukrayinka v shkoli: posibnyk dlya vchyteliv. Kiev: Radyans'ka shkola, 1966, pp. 147-156.
- Polushkina, L. S. "Lesya Ukrayinka yak mayster psykholohichnoyi kharakterystyky ('Kaminny hospodar')," Radyans'ke literaturoznavstvo, IX, No. 2 (February, 1965), pp. 19-30.
- Polyans'ka, Yevheniya. "Lirychny tsykl v tvorchosti Lesi Ukrayinky." In Lesya Ukrayinka, Publikatsiyi, statti, doslidzhennya, II. Kiev: Akademiya nauk Ukr. RSR, 1956, pp. 231-258.
- Shpyl'ova, O. "Dramatychni poemy Lesi Ukrayinky 'Vavylons'ky polon' i 'Na ruyinakh'." In Lesya Ukrayinka, Publikatsiyi, statti, doslidzhennya, III. Kiev: Akademiya nauk Ukr. RSR, 1960, pp. 195-241.
- Siehs, K. "Lesya Ukrainka." The Ukrainian Review, Vol. X, No. III (1963), pp. 73-86.
- Stonequist, Everett V. "The Problem of the Marginal Man." Social Problems in America. Elizabeth Briant Lee and Alfred McClung Lee (eds.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1955, pp. 366-367.
- "Ukraine in the Russian Empire 1800-1917," Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopedia, Vol. I, pp. 667-696.
- Yakubs'ky, B. "Yohanna zhinka Khusova." In Lesya Ukrayinka, Tvory, VIII. New York: Tyshchenko and Bilous Publishing Co., 1954, pp. 45-53.
- Zadesnyans'ky, R. [Mlynovets'ky, Roman]. "'Lisova pisnya' Lesi Ukrayinky ta 'Zatopleny dzvin Havptmana,'" Krytychni narysy. Tvorchist' Lesi Ukrayinky, IV. N.p.: Ukrains'ka krytychna dumka, n.d., pp. 99-112.
- _____. "'Lisova pisnya' Lesi Ukrayinky ta 'Zatopleny dzvin Havptmana,'" Tvorchist' Lesi Ukrayinky. Krytychni narysy (2nd ed.), IV. N.p.: Ukrayins'ka krytychna dumka, n.d., pp. 122-136.

_____. "Vid uhodovstva do natsional'noyi zrady," Krytychni narysy.
Tvorchist' Lesi Ukrayinky, IV. N.p.: Ukrayins'ka krytychna
dumka, n.d., pp. 78-98.

_____. "Vid uhodovstva do natsional'noyi zrady," Krytychni narysy.
Tvorchist' Lesi Ukrayinky (2nd ed.), IV. N.p.: Ukrayins'ka
krytychna dumka, n.d., pp. 100-136.

Zerov, Mykola. "Rufin i Pristsilla (Do istoriyi zadumu i vykonannya)."
In Lesya Ukrayinka, Tvory, VII. New York: Tyshchenko and
Bilous, 1953-1954, pp. 21-41.

B29898